

# SOCIAL TENSIONS IN INDIA

G. S. GHURYE



POPULAR PRAKASHAN, BOMBAY

*First published*

Shravan 1890

Printed in India

Printed by

Mohan G. Shirali

at Mohan Mudranalaya

Acme Estate, Sewri (East)

Bombay 15 DD

Published by

G. R. Bhatkal

for Popular Prakashan

35c, Tardeo Road

Bombay 34 WB



*To the dear memory*

*of*

*Tāi,*

*my mother.*



## A WORD TO THE READER

SOCIAL TENSIONS, in the more familiar title of group-tensions, have formed the subject of deep, frequent and wide study by International and/or national organizations during the last two decades. Conflict is a concept inseparably connected with tensions. And both of them have formed the subject-matter of discussion and analysis by Sociologists atleast since the days of Simmel. Integration is an inevitable accompaniment, being the accredited solvent of conflict and tension. The notion of integration has come into prominence only recently, though Mary P. Follett first used it theoretically and practically almost half a century ago. The Sociologists' view of social tensions, conflict and integration is presented in the first Chapter. The reader, it is hoped, will thereby be in a better position to appraise the problem of minorities and to evaluate schemes for solution of the problems attempted anywhere, in Europe, in Africa or in India.

Next Chapter embodies a brief review of conflict and tensions as they manifested themselves in Eastern Europe in the first four decades of our century. The solutions of "the minorities problem" in operation in that part of the world are briefly reviewed to enable the reader to make a comparative estimate of the method of integration and that of the "minority status". The review further offers the reader an explanation of the apparent paradox that many responsible individuals and nations at the end of World War II looked askance at "the method of minority status" for solving "minority problems".

The new method primarily rests on recognition and guarantee of various rights as universal rights to individuals and not to groups. In this context the Seminar on Problems of Multinational Society arranged under the UN auspices in 1965 assumes great and even sinister significance. The very title of the Seminar with its 'Multinational Society', if not ambiguous, must raise qualms in the minds of loyal and patriotic citizens of many new nations that have come up during the last two decades after travails of a century or so. The so-called conclusions of the participants in the situation require to be taken seriously, whatever their intrinsic worth. The task of appraising the value and the actual implications of the 'conclusions' is rendered difficult as the Director of the Human Rights Division of the UN has not obliged us by presenting the contents of the three "background" papers. The obtuseness of some of the so-called 'conclusions' and their dangerous implications for the viability and solidarity of the 'new nations' are

brought out in the third Chapter.

The fourth Chapter logically acquaints the reader with the provisions for "minorities" and "sections of people" in the Constitution of India. The Constitution recognizes only Linguistic and/or Religious Minorities.

Equipped with the knowledge of the nature of modern "multi-group society", the nature of group-tensions and conflicts and their solvent, the process and end of integration, and a proper appraisal of the 'minority status' method in resolving group conflicts and tensions, the reader will find that his study of the specific historical background is meaningful.

The main 'minority problem' of India centres round Muslims, who are both a Religious and a Linguistic minority, though they are not mentioned by name in the Constitution. A running commentary on the contacts between the Muslims and the Hindus in India, the former as conquerors for a fairly long time and then as rulers and co-citizens, becomes necessary. Without dwelling on details, three Chapters present to the reader three views of the main events and relations. One of them is the author's view. And that is that though there appeared to be some commingling across religious boundaries for military purposes, the main current kept the two communities separate and distinct, the native Hindu endeavouring to keep himself alive with honour and even to regain his lost dominion, and the incoming Muslim, albeit with a large influx of native converts, strenuously countering the moves, drawing upon his native store-house in foreign lands. There was hardly any rapprochement between the two cultures, the Hindu and the Muslim, in spite of co-existence. There was very little give and take even in the domain of art and architecture. In the latter field the Hindu temple steadfastly kept to its form and the Hindu house and palace, monumental and mortuary structures set up new patterns showing no influence of Muslim parallel structures.

The unfolding of this phenomenon through the century of political awakening in pre-Independence India has been put before the public by many students and was a live topic of controversy for some years before Independence. It does not form part of the scheme of the present study for the simple reason that I am concerned here with Muslim Indians. And the ideas, thoughts and actions of my fellow countrymen can be a proper index of the state of mind and of tensions or tensional situations.

Logically, the ninth Chapter presents a full analysis of the important proposals that Muslim leaders and/or intellectuals had put up during the fateful pre-partition decade 1936-1945 to stave off partition. Many of them, if not all, are the citizens of India (Bharat) today. The territorial division and politico-administrative set-up advocated by them bears a common stamp and converge, though under different and often rational-looking lubrications, towards securing Muslim dominion over very much larger territory and at many more strategic points than has come to the lot of Muslims of Pakistan and India of today taken together. The state of mind en-

gendered by this dispensation naturally is one of frustration. To add to this are the observations over partition, reluctantly acquiesced in by nationalist Muslims, made by such staunch Indians as the late Maulana Azad in his autobiography.

The nature of thoughts and the kind of activity of as many Muslim Indians as possible can help us either to substantiate the assertion of Muslim frustration or to modify it as rendered necessary by their proper appraisal. Chapters 10 and 11 present an authentic sample of some thoughts and actions of Muslim Indians. And a running commentary is made keeping in view the essentials of national solidarity.

Violent behaviour is tension manifesting itself as conflict and affords the most ostensible sign of lack of solidarity. In the twelfth Chapter, the riots that have taken place between Hindus and Muslims known to history are recorded with as much faithfulness and detail as the sources and the available space could permit. The panorama is stereotyped through the long vista of over four centuries. Reaching much further back than the advent of the British rule in India the stereotype is more or less the same. The mutual incompatibility of some religious practices of the two communities generally has been the proximate cause of these clashes. But the climate of social life, viz. segregation and absence of rapprochement in spite of common residence, is their nurture-medium. The origins of some of the riots of post-Independence day do not conform to this description. They are much more disturbing to the mind of a patriotic Indian, making him nervous on the score of national solidarity. They indicate to some extent a militancy whose repercussions may be very serious.

The background, both theoretical and actual, having been thus clearly laid out, Indian tensions, whether Linguistic Minority or others, may be analysed for easy comprehension. Linguistic tensions in India are of three types: (1) Those that are bound up with Linguistic States, i.e., States formed so that every State has a specific language as the mother-tongue of a preponderatingly large number of its residents. The carving out of these Linguistic States has left within a Linguistic State small or large pockets of people whose mother-tongue is some other Indian language than the one which can become the official language of that State. The exigencies of work or business have led and are leading some people out of their Linguistic State into another. Both these sets of people form the centre of this type of Linguistic Tensions. (2) Those that are bound up with Urdu and (3) Those that arise out of the Constitutional provision for Hindi as the Official Language of the Union and the opposition to its implementation.

I have only briefly touched on the first variety of linguistic tensions, particularly mentioning the case of Cachar District of Assam and the Bengali and Assamese tension over it.

The tensions centring on open and stiff opposition to Hindi as the sole Official Language of the Union have been manifested in Tamilnad during

the last fifteen years. However, even in the Constituent Assembly, almost all Tamilian members had expressed in no unmistakable manner their unwilling acquiescence in the Constitutional provision making Hindi the Official Language of the Union. Some at least of the Bengali members, too, had voiced their misgivings in the matter. The Government had evidently borne in mind some of the views and had, soon after coming into power, evolved the three-languages formula. The formula, if it had not been modified and had been loyally and unswervingly implemented, was such that the situation for the implementation of the Constitutional provision would have been facilitated. But both in Tamilnad and Uttar Pradesh, more in the former, the formula was nonchalantly bypassed.

The question of script is intimately bound up with the Official Language. The Muslims had expressed their views on Devanagari script, directly or indirectly, even in the Constituent Assembly which clearly foreshadowed tension arising among them. They have now largely taken the path of indirect attack on Devanagari through propaganda and support for the adoption of Roman script for Hindi, though retaining the Urdu script because it is Koranic. The Russian experiment and final action on script is very illuminating in this context, as also the opinions of expert linguists. All this forms the subject-matter of Chapter 13.

Urdu is claimed as the language of Muslims all over India. And indirect attempts have been on foot to achieve equality of status for it alongside of Hindi. These are important elements in the complex of Linguistic Tensions. The Muslims, however, are in the terminology of the Constitution of India, not only a linguistic but also a religious minority, though they are not so dubbed in it by name. The tensions centring round opposition to Hindi in Tamilnad have assumed for the present a serious form. But the probable tensions bound up with the rights of minorities, as applicable to Muslim Indians are no less dangerous. The repercussions on national solidarity and even on the country's integrity of these tensions are briefly explained in the last Chapter.

The Governmental effort at integration is described and appraisal of the technique and content of the integrational endeavour is presented in the same chapter, on the background of the provisions in the Constitution.

In the end I may state the faith that has guided the making of this book. And that is what is enshrined in the following conviction of Abraham Lincoln: "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do and know how to do it."

G. S. GHURYE

## CONTENTS

<i>A Word to the Reader</i>	<i>vii</i>
1 Tension, Conflict and Integration	1
2 Social Tensions and Minorities	42
3 Human Rights and Minorities	75
4 The Constitution of India ( <i>Bharat</i> ) and Minorities	113
5 Indian History and Culture — Three Views (I)	129
6 Indian History and Culture — Three Views (II)	169
7 Indian History and Culture — Three Views (III)	199
8 The So-called Hindu Muslim Fusion in Art and Architecture	222
9 Muslim Frustration	259
10 Hindu-Muslim Riots	304
11 Some Thoughts and Actions of Muslim Indians (I)	352
12 Some Thoughts and Actions of Muslim Indians (II)	395
13 Linguistic Tensions	430
14 Integration or National Solidarity	485
<i>Index</i>	<i>537</i>





## CHAPTER

### 1

## TENSION, CONFLICT AND INTEGRATION

It is the principle of 'diversity within unity' which dominates productivity, the principle that is so basic to a democratic solution of the problem of minorities and to democratic living in all types of groups, from small face-to-face groups to world organization.<sup>1</sup>

KURT LEWIN

Nationalism cannot be properly appreciated as an isolated political and psychological phenomenon. It must be regarded as a special case of the more general and permanent problem of group integration. Far-reaching questions of sociology and group psychology are involved . . .<sup>2</sup>

ROYAL INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

For the sociologists, mutually supporting inputs into a social system tend to be associated with growth of structure, expansion of functions, development equilibrium—in short, a process summed up as integration.<sup>3</sup>

ERNST B. HAAS

"TENSIONS ARE universal phenomenon of social life. They occur in the domestic no less than in the international sphere," says Hans Morgenthau,<sup>4</sup> the well-known American authority on Political Science. And tensions are both an index and an aftermath of conflict, for they presage an open conflict, whether accompanied by violence, abuse, hot words or more excited argument, and followed by enmity, sabotage, non-cooperation or mere sullenness. In whatever sector of human life they exist or have existed, their coming to the forefront and in the focus of intellectual light is a fairly recent phenomenon. Psychology and international conflict and International Politics have brought this about during the last fifty years. Sociology has not yet incorporated the concept in its conspectus of study as well as both the disciplines of Psychology and Political Science have done, though talk about social tensions has been rife.

Absence of a note on "tensions" or "social tensions" in the great Ameri-

<sup>1</sup> Kurt Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts*, 1948, p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Nationalism*, 1939, p. XIII.

<sup>3</sup> Ernst B. Haas, *Beyond the Nation-State*, 1964, p. 26.

<sup>4</sup> *Politics Among Nations*, 3rd ed., p. 435.

can venture, *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, so late as the latter part of the third decade of the century provides a measure of the lack of attention paid to the phenomenon or notion of tension by Social Scientists. Professor Fairchild's *Dictionary of Sociology*, published at the end of the fourth decade, is perhaps the first sociological work of importance to take serious notice of the notion. Fairchild, giving a comprehensive note on tensions in general, i.e., chemical, mechanical, etc., adds one on "social tension".

Professor R. M. MacIver even in the latest edition of his valuable textbook on Sociology, *Society*,<sup>5</sup> brings in intergroup tensions in connection with his treatment of the topic of ethnic and racial groups and tells his readers that "the phenomena of prejudice, tension, and discrimination between groups are extremely variable" and that UNESCO had set up a competent committee to study "the conditions of international tensions". He gives his readers a fairly good account of associations and their internal conflicts, stating *inter alia* that "forces are generated or revealed within the associations that cause tensions and strains in its solidarity". He has given us a fine conspectus of social change with a competent account of the technological factor. But nowhere is there any suggestion that social change may be attended with tension sometimes. In the earlier, i.e., 1937 edition of the book we read of "tensions within the economic system".<sup>6</sup> He has enumerated 51 attitudes in his classification of "attitudes of persons exhibited in relations with other persons". I would not say that "tension" is an attitude but certainly among such states of mind as "humility", "snobishness", "patronage", "arrogance", "scorn", "aversion", "spitefulness" and "suspicion", which figure among the 51 attitudes, "tension" should find a place somewhere. For it is a state of mind which renders the group or a member of the group, which is the cause of "tension", obnoxious, and tends to evoke a pattern of behaviour which may be marked by or compounded of more than one of the above-mentioned attitudes.

All social change is a change from status quo; and in all societies the whole complex and range of social forces tend to be behind the status quo. We know that in England, for example, the transition from feudal society to early industrial society was marked by a number of uprisings, with tensions mounting higher before the actual explosion. And Professor Bonamy Dobree has brought together in one place five of these occurrences in his book *The English Revolts* (1937). Three of them are quite clearly the climaxes of tension due to social and economic changes bursting forth into organized violence. Professor Dobree<sup>7</sup> himself writes about two of them, the Peasants' Revolt and the Chartist violence, that they were consequences of "the emotions bred in the hearts of those who were oppressed, frus-

<sup>5</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 28, 415-16, 449, 543-87.

<sup>6</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 264, 305.

<sup>7</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 12.

trated of food and freedom". The causal emotions of the Great Rebellion (1640-1660) were according to him due both to the above-mentioned frustration and frustration of power.

G. M. Trevelyan,<sup>8</sup> the twentieth century social historian of England, says about the Tudor Reformation: "But the Tudor Reformation was not carried through without attendant misery and violence". He records the Norfolk riot of 1549, known as Kett's rising, as having been due to "social and economic grievances". Of the earlier popular rising, the Peasants' Revolt described by Dobree, he says: "The battle for freedom, differing in its precise character from manor to manor and from farm to farm, led to sporadic acts of violence that prepared the way for the rising of 1381".

In India, contemporary tensions attracted the early attention of the UNESCO, but failed to receive any appropriate understanding. During the half-century 1860-1910, we can observe tension and high tension in certain classes of society, as, what is called social reform—in reality social change consciously attempted to be effected—was being advocated and partially implemented. The life histories of such men as Keshab Chandra Sen, Pandit Vidyasagar, M. G. Ranade, Jyotiba Phule, Maharshi Karve, Professor G. G. Agarkar, Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Gopal Krishna Gokhale fully bear out the existence of tension and high tension, climaxing on occasions.

Of the sociologists only two appear to have taken note of the attitude called "tension" in intergroup relations. Robert E. Park, the earlier of the two, notes the phenomenon and characterizes it, too, but without giving it the appropriate name of "tension". And the credit of inviting Park's attention to the phenomenon as obtaining in the relations between the Negroes (Blacks) and non-Negro-Americans (Whites) goes to Alfred H. Stone, who contributed the paper "Is Race Friction between Blacks and Whites in the United States Growing and Inevitable" to the *American Journal of Sociology* in 1907-08 (Vol. XIII). Sometime later R. E. Park seems to have written on the subject more explicitly and from our point of view almost specifically. In 1921, Park and Burgess<sup>9</sup> adopted Stone's definition of friction as primarily a "lack of harmony" or a "mutual irritation", qualifying it with the observation that "in the case of races it is accentuated by antipathy". Endorsing further Park's earlier and individual view, they elaborated the view which I consider was to foreshadow or rather to highlight what is now universally known as "tension". They say: "We do not have to depend on race riots or other acts of violence as a measure of growth of race friction. *Its existence may be manifested by a*

*look or a gesture as well as by a word or an act."* Of the other sociologist, R. M. Williams, who goes further than Park and Burgess, I shall speak later as his work was evidently one of a piece designed by the UNESCO.

Tension originally came perhaps from the discipline of Physiology and Physiological Psychology. In the latter discipline it must have been adopted from its basic physiology but applied in wider contexts. Tension is a property, capacity or trait of certain units or kinds of living matter. Thus tension is a quality or property of the lungs and John A. Clements<sup>10</sup> has defined it in that aspect as "the manifestation of the universal intermolecular force that is observed in the surfaces of fluids". Drives or organic cravings which are "the original motive power for activity" originate in "various segments of the autonomic nervous system". When one of them begins to operate, tension accumulates in particular segments of the system and causes "restlessness and random activity" till it is eased by appropriate activity. The equilibrium of the whole organism gets upset and resetting up the equilibrium is the aim and end of the living process. The two principal drives and tensions accorded this dignity of prime movers are: the nutritional and the sexual. The latter is particularly strong and is singled out for being crowned the monarch of all drives and tensions; for sexual or erotic tension, according to one school of Psychology, the Freudian, is "the root of many neurotic adjustments in and distortions of human personality".<sup>11</sup>

Even before Kurt Lewin developed a system of Social Psychology, which is generally known as Field Theory but may just as well be called Tensional Psychology, Political Scientists, like Harold Lasswell used the concept to express some of the items of their discipline, as quoted by Quincy Wright.<sup>12</sup> But though the use of the notion of "tension" was made in connection with the explanation of the dynamics of political life, it is quite clear that another expression was thought to fulfil the purpose equally well. Wright says that Lasswell in one place opines that "the dynamic of politics is to be sought in the tension level of the individuals in society", while in another place, while explaining the speed with which new symbols are adopted, one of the facets of the dynamic of politics, he uses the expression "insecurity level". Earlier still as quoted by Wright again, A. L. Lowell too used the concept of "tension level" in the exposition of certain political phenomena.

Quincy Wright, then Professor of International Law at Chicago University, dealing with public opinion and war, and expounding the conditions promoting opinions favourable to war, finds it necessary to ascertain the meaning of the expression "general tension level" and the conditions "favouring extreme tension levels" and "high tension between particular groups"

Distinguishing two phases of "general tension level", positive and negative, he compares the former "to the potential energy of a dynamic system" and the latter to "the tensions of the materials in a static system", evidently adapting Lasswell's view. "The tension level, indicates the quantity of social energy available to the leaders of a group, and it varies proportionately to the intensity and homogeneity of opinion", so that if every one of the members of a group or a population, is "intensely loyal to the same symbol, the tension level is at a positive maximum". Per contra, every one being intensely loyal to a different symbol, the tension level will be at "a negative maximum". This account of tensions and their levels refers no doubt to social tensions; but they are not specific to groups. The nature of inter-group tensions and their measurement, or rather the estimate of their extent and depth, can be made from "changes in various indices of the friendliness or unfriendliness of each group towards the other".<sup>13</sup>

The tensions in general with their positive and negative kinds, and their two or three intensities, which Professor Quincy Wright described, are what may be called in ordinary parlance examples of eagerness and enthusiasm or their lack. Eagerness, enthusiasm, despair and depression, like many feelings such as fear and anger, have a tendency to be not only additive or cumulative but also infective and contagious, heightening them in the individual and also in the group when they are felt and in characteristic manner expressed by some individuals of the group. The inter-group tensions, too, have these traits. But inter-group tensions unlike general tensions, which may and often do act like the physio-psychological drives of an individual, are commonly disruptive or fissiparous even when they are not violent. They are at the least the equivalent of what sullenness stands for and makes for in an individual. And it is these latter that are our concern in this work. But before briefly dilating on their nature we have to acquaint ourselves of the approach of the tensional psychology of Kurt Lewin.

Lewin speaks of "systems of tensions" within the individual and separates the "pressure emanating from" the environment, i.e., the individual's motives depending upon group pressures, speaking of the two together as "field forces" which has given the common label "field theory" to his psychological contribution.<sup>14</sup>

The articles of Kurt Lewin, brought together in the book *Resolving Social Conflicts*, were written between 1935 and 1946. Beginning with the problems of a minority group, the Jews in this case, they range over the whole field of conflicts in society, except the international field. The concept of tension, however, is not used or brought in in all of them.

In the Jewish example Lewin dwells on self-hatred both as an individual and a group phenomenon and yet his view of tension as the result of con-

fluct—I do not think he thought of tension as both its index and the cause of the manifestation of conflict or of active or operative conflict—comes out even there. As he says in his earliest of the pronouncements contained in the book mentioned above (1935), “*any conflict creates tension, which leads to restlessness, unbalanced behaviour and over-emphasis in one or the other direction*”. And as eliminator of the psychopathic phenomenon of self-hatred he proposes “normalizing the tension level” of the Jews by themselves, squarely facing their minority problems as much as a problem of the society in which they live as of the individual Jews of their minority.

In his “solution of a chronic conflict in industry” where he presents an illustration of a case-study of conflict in a factory, that too, “a long smouldering conflict that periodically flared out but [was] always patched up”, “tension” between Paulson, the mechanic, and Sulinda, the supervisor, crops up as inferred by the interceder from certain verbal behaviour of one of the two. The epilogue, however, speaks of “relations” being “better than they had ever been” and of absence of conflicts, or of “good relations in a previously fighting triangle”.<sup>15</sup> Here is then only interpersonal tension, its cause, and its resolution or elimination dealt with. Conflict in marriage, though in reality an interpersonal one under the norms and traditions current about the institution of marriage as against the previous one under the factory organization, is dealt with by Lewin<sup>16</sup> as a group-conflict. Though only two persons are directly involved, the wife and the husband, Lewin calls the two together a group forming “generally a part of a larger family”, which is “a more inclusive group”. I should treat the case as that of interpersonal tension, only two individuals being involved.

However looked upon, the conflict in marriage case-study provides us with Lewin’s view of interpersonal tension and what it looks like or means. He states that “one of the most important factors in the frequency of conflict and in the building up of an emotional outbreak is the general level of tension at which the person or group [?] lives”. “Tension level” is otherwise referred to as “social atmosphere” and we are assured that the tension level or the social atmosphere prevailing in a group determines or conditions the particular event or events that produce conflict. The same of course is more true of individuals, whether husband or wife or others. The relative satisfaction of the needs of the two, in this case husband and wife, the comparative readiness to leave or bypass an “unpleasant situation” among others affect the tension level of the partners to a marriage.<sup>17</sup>

In 1941 Professor Robert C. Angell of Michigan University, who later in 1956 or thereabouts collaborated with three other intellectuals to give us the UNESCO brochure on *Conflict*, pondering over the American scene of multi-group society and being rather ill at ease about American solidarity,

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 156, 186, 197-200.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 135-36.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 84-95.

produced his book *Integration of American Society*. It was the first book of its kind with integration in its title and as its aim. It speaks of conflict between groups. As a matter of fact the conflicting aims and objects and operations of some of the vast number of groups in America channelizing the social life of Americans had led to his writing the book. Yet tension is hardly ever mentioned in it. The nearest approach to it was still the thirty-year-old one of Stone and Park mentioned above, viz., friction.<sup>18</sup> The study of "intra-group tensions" made by W. R. Bion and J. Richman in 1943<sup>19</sup> is perhaps the earliest, outside the group of studies that came in after the UNESCO urged or organized such enterprises.

Robin M. Williams' book entitled *The Reduction of Inter-group Tensions* published under the aegis of Social Science Research Council in 1947, however, is the first full-fledged work on inter-group tensions and represents the American contribution to the solution of an important social problem in many societies, including American, and possibly also to the resolution of international tensions.

Williams states the position very clearly about "a minimum of group conflict" being a permanent feature of societies like that of America with their competitive systems of economic endeavour; and adds the very valuable factual experience of the American society, viz., how social changes cause temporary strains over and above the permanent level of tension. This was rendered possible by the events of the Second World War in America, both during its continuance and its aftermath. Williams pondering over all this warned his countrymen, in a more authoritative and specific manner than Robert Angell six years earlier could do, that the rapid change that was taking place with its "correlative strain and tension" might lead to some conspicuous inter-group conflict.

Williams<sup>20</sup>, profiting by the discussion of Grosser and Korchin and the Sociologist Talcott Parsons as in *Approaches to National Unity* by L. Bryson and others (1945), has defined some of the basic concepts involved in the topic of tension. Leaving out "group", "prejudice", "discrimination", and "competition" and "aggression", I shall note here the substance of his definition of "group hostility", reserving that of "conflict" for the next section where it properly belongs. Group hostility is a shared and common attitude, shown or seen in verbal and/or non-verbal acts, which disparage, insult, ostracize, threaten and/or injure members of a social group towards which hostility is entertained. Inter-group hostility is conditioned to a large extent by the level of tension in a society. "*The tension level of any social grouping is in part a function of the relative emphasis in the group's culture upon 'participation in common values' as over against individual or group acquisition of scarce 'goods'.*"

<sup>18</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 219.

<sup>19</sup> *Lancet*, II, 878 (*Human Relations*, 1949, pp. 14-16, f.n.)

<sup>20</sup> *Reduction of Inter-Group Tensions*, pp. 4-5.

This description, definition or analysis of group tension or social tension is the best that I think has been done so far by anyone. The tension level can be raised by economic distress or depression or by other kinds of social maladjustment or by prior cultural conflict or as I shall point out, by daily or periodical talk or news-reporting about differences and contrasts, cultural, political and economic.

The quotation about the ubiquity of tension with which we started the consideration of this rather disturbing and even disruptive mental state, whether within individuals, between individuals and within groups or between groups, was an assertion made by Professor Morgenthau<sup>21</sup> not before 1949 when his justly famous and popular though ponderous book was first published. The significance of that attitude in the field of International Politics, it appears, was seen the furthest by this penetrating thinker; and in the edition of the book \* published in 1963, which I have used, we find some shrewd and deeper observations about it. I shall state here only two of them which are most significant for the problems presented in this work. First, tensions in a society occur when changes in the status quo become desirable in the view of some one or some section. They manifest themselves "in public controversies, election campaigns, parliamentary debates and governmental crisis"; I have already stated so in brief. From Morgenthau's further affirmation we have to conclude that "when groups of the population [society] identified respectively with the status quo and the demand for change oppose each other like two armed camps, unable to appeal to the arbitrament of majority vote or to common standards of justice" the society has entered or is entering "a pre-revolutionary or revolutionary stage". Second, tension—Professor Morgenthau is writing about international tensions only, but his observation, I think, is equally true about many inter-group tensions—is like an iceberg, "the main part of which is submerged" and not seen.<sup>22</sup>

Tensions, whether because of the psychologists' din or because of the international clamour, became so much a component of the social climate that a British novelist, E. M. Delafield, an unmarried lady, whom the *Observer* pronounced to be not only "witty" but as an "astonishingly true" portrayer of "pictures of various atmospheres and societies", produced a whole famous novel named *Tension*, featuring a number of characters, all exhibiting various types of tensions. It reminds me of Jane Austin's novels, *Pride and Prejudice*, *Sense and Sensibility*, and *Persuasion*, and demonstrates the long and tortuous path society in general and British society in particular has traversed to arrive at a not very commendable stage!

Upon this scene of studies of attitude to tension appeared the UNESCO with its comprehensive scheme of Tension and Technology Series and its

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 42-3 (f.n.), 56-7.

\* It is the 20th printing from its first publication.

<sup>22</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 429, 437-38.



concern with International Tensions. The first fruit of the UNESCO endeavour was seen in 1956 in the form of the book entitled *Social Implications of Industrialization and Urbanization in Africa South of the Sahara*. Though the fat volume rarely speaks of tension or friction or crisis,<sup>25</sup> it is a notable contribution to the unravelling of tensions, their spread and their nature, obtaining in African nations and communities, which were getting themselves freed from colonial domination, whether they were being industrialized newly or since colonial days. Next year followed the brochure entitled *The Nature of Conflict* being a symposiastic contribution of four scholars, three Sociologists and one Psychologist, to the unravelling of international tensions and the breeding grounds of international conflicts. From the viewpoint in this section, i.e., tension, there is unfortunately little in it that need engross our attention. We are indeed glad to be informed that Japanese Sociologists and others, evidently working on commission from the UNESCO, have recognized nine distinct groups of tensions in their society. They are: (1) Tensions in family life (2) Tensions within communities; (3) Tensions between coteries; (4) [Tensions around] the problem of the "Eta" outcasts; (5) Racial tensions; (6) Tensions in religious life; (7) Tensions in economic life; (8) Ideological tensions; and (9) Tensions among young people.<sup>26</sup>

Professor Raymond Aron in the same brochure has put forward the viewpoint adopted here regarding tension and conflict, in his statement that leaving intra-individual tensions and fixing our attention on inter-individual (or, as I would like to say, inter-personal) tensions, one "insensibly moves from the idea of tension to that of struggle or conflict".<sup>25</sup>

The concept of tension in relation to marital role studied by Bernard Farber and Leonard S. Blackman<sup>26</sup> in 1956 was so far developed that they employed eleven personality items to prepare the tension-index.

It is these inter-personal tensions and inter-group tensions that are intended to be covered by the expression "social tensions" in this work. I shall be outlining the nature of groups and their tremendous development in modern society. However, before doing so, it is necessary to state my view of society in justification of my use of the expression "Social Tensions" in place of inter-group tensions and inter-personal tensions.

Society was defined by Professor L. T. Hobhouse,<sup>27</sup> half a century ago, as "tissue of relationships". Thirty years ago, Professor MacIver<sup>28</sup> defined society in more or less the same terms when he said that society is "the web of social relationships". W. Llyod Warner and Paul S. Lunt, at the end of a deeply detailed and profoundly synthetic study of an American

<sup>25</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 19, 41-3, 46, 501, 506, 577, 614, 623, 633, 635-38.

<sup>26</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 179.

<sup>28</sup> *American Sociological Review*, p. 596.

<sup>29</sup> *Hasting's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Sociology.

<sup>30</sup> *Society*, 1937, p. 6.

community offered in 1941, in the book entitled *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, defined society as "a group of mutually interacting individuals".<sup>29</sup> In the 1957 edition of their *Society*,<sup>30</sup> MacIver and Page repeat MacIver's earlier definition of society as "the web of social relationships" but after stating that society is "a system of usages and procedures, of authority and mutual aid, of many groupings and divisions, and of controls of human behaviour and of liberties." I prefer, in the light of the great significance of groups for individuals and society, to define society as an integrate of groups and of members of those groups. Both the individual and the group are primaries in all human societies. No individual has been known apart from a group, the biological group of the family in whatever form being the ultimate unit present through the known period of human history. The individual's contact with and knowledge of his society are achieved only through groups of which he becomes a member, the groups being appropriate for the age and stage at which a human individual has arrived.

The importance of groups as socializers of individuals and as the channels through which individuals get into the stream of society, or in other words through which individuals realize their status and being in society, should be quite clear to anyone who has studied Hindu civilization. For in it, it is through the mediacy of a group, subcaste or caste, and craft-guild or village and not only the family, nuclear or extended, or even kin-groups, many of which or almost all of which were supposed to have a controlling agency, entitled to take note of an individual's doings, and each one of which had its own rules or regulations or mores, "dharma" as they were called, and almost all of which were involuntary, that an individual got his experience of the social milieu and became its constituent.

In American Sociology, which is now hundred years old, groups as constituent elements of society figure in Park and Burgess' *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*<sup>31</sup>—more than halfway down in its career (1921)—where they distinguish two kinds of groups: (1) Conflict groups and (2) Accommodation groups. Among the ten groups of the two categories, though "gangs" figure, the primary group of family is lacking. The concept of group and its significance to Sociology was a new acquisition of American Sociology when Park and Burgess included it in their *Sociology*. It is rather emphatically stressed by Bodenhafér's contention<sup>32</sup> in 1920 that L. F. Ward's Sociology too had envisaged the importance of the concept. For it is a spacious plea to detect in Ward's work the concept of group which he hardly ever mentions. By its spacious insistence the assertion proves that when Bodenhafér wrote in 1920 the concept of group had come to be recognized by American Sociologists as significant for Sociology.

<sup>29</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>30</sup> P. 5.

<sup>31</sup> P. 722.

<sup>32</sup> *The American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. XXVI (1920). pp. 273-314.

The same issue of *The American Journal of Sociology* which contained Bodenhafer's paper on Ward's Sociology, also carried what strikes me as a very important contribution on the nature and function of groups for individuals and society by Thomas D. Eliot (pp. 333-352). Eliot, furnishing a psychoanalytic interpretation of group formation and behaviour, has given us diagrammatic representations of a developed personality which I think is even better than the one later provided by Kurt Lewin.<sup>33</sup> The diagram in figure 3 (p. 340) called by Eliot "symbol of the possible group affiliations" is an even more impressive epitome of an individual in society and is unrivalled as a diagrammatic visual representation of the significance of groups and of the relationship between them and an individual on the one hand, and of the latter and his Society on the other. The explanatory note has to serve here the function of the elaborate diagram presented in the journal by Eliot. It reads:

. . . each impulse or desire is followed out into its fulfilment in group activities, symbolized by the clusters of triangles which represent other individuals with a similar interest. Dotted lines represent interlocking memberships because of which certain minor groups were selected to serve the individual's dominant purpose.

It is highly interesting, and to some extent at least intriguing, that a Political Scientist or a Social Philosopher, who was destined to influence for at least two generations the thought and practice of Business Management, should have stated the lesson of Eliot's diagrammatic representation in words the very next year. Miss Mary Folett Parker, in her book *The New State* first published in 1921, wrote (pp. 114-15):

Compromise is accepted not only as an inevitable and an entirely proper, but as the most significant fact of human association, by those economists who belong to that school of 'group sociologists' which sees present society as made up of warring groups . . . . The integrating of ideas which comes partly from direct interpretation, and partly from that indirect interpretation which is the consequence of the overlapping membership of groups, I see going on very largely in the groups to which I belong and is surely an interesting sign-post to future methods of association.

It appears that it took a whole decade for the lesson tried to be inculcated by Eliot in his paper and its accompanying diagrammatic illustration for the significance of the concept of group to strike a permanent root in American Sociology. Florian Znaniecki<sup>34</sup> writing in 1954 informs us that it

<sup>33</sup> *Resolving Social Conflicts*, p. 21, fig. II; p. 94, fig. XIV.

<sup>34</sup> "Social Groups in the Modern World" in Morroe Berger and others, *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, pp. 125-40.

was Eubank who put forward his fully considered view in 1932 that "the concept of group would become the main foundation of systematic sociology." Professor MacIver in the 1937 edition of his well-known popular textbook furnished students of Sociology with not only a conspectus of groups and associations but also a definition of the concept. "A Group", according to him, is "any collection of social beings who enter into distinctive social relationships",<sup>35</sup> a view reiterated even in the 1957 edition of the work. Though I do not agree with the definition, I shall not enter into any discussion as my purpose is to get on to the core of the subject, the integrative function of groups in human society, a particular society's picture being internalized for its constituent members through groups, multifarious or few as the case may be, of each society.

The importance of "group" is reflected in Professor Kimball Young's definition of Sociology made in his book *An Introductory Sociology* published in 1934. Says Young: (p. xiii) "Broadly speaking, sociology deals with the behaviour of men in groups."

The possible disturbance of social peace, not through the hostility and conflict among ethnic or racial groups, but non-ethnic to, and therefore more organically related to society, too, it appears, was first voiced by Read Bain in 1938-39.<sup>36</sup> And two years thereafter, i.e., in 1941 no less an American Sociologist than Professor Robert C. Angell brought out a whole book making out a case for serious concern regarding the conflictive role of the multiplicity and variety of groups in American society. Significantly enough he entitled his book *The Integration of American Society*. The kind of appraisal of his society that prompted Professor Angell to undertake a study of integration of American Society is thus stated by him: "So significant has become the role of free-standing groups in contemporary life that one is tempted to say that our society is characterized by group individualism . . . . We cannot assume that the rise of specialized groups is disintegrative . . . . But whether these groups are in fact harmoniously correlated in our modern communities is exactly the question." And he concludes that *there is great need to see that common orientation is increased* and not merely to reduce friction and conflict as it appears and exists.<sup>37</sup>

The great importance of Angell's work from our viewpoint is not only that he brings out the friction and conflict owing to the multiplicity of groups in American Society but also because he points out the fact that there was no authoritative definition of the concept of group and even more because he attempted the first classification<sup>38</sup> of groups on almost a purely sociological basis, going further than Park.

<sup>35</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 13, 16, 144, 262-3; *Society, An Introductory Analysis*, 1957, pp. 14, 223, 228.

<sup>36</sup> *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1938-39, pp. 499-509.

<sup>37</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 3-4, 211, 215, 219-20. Italics mine.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 35-8.

"The year in which Angell's book appeared saw the birth of another very significant sociological book, W. Lloyd Warner and P. S. Lunt's *The Social Life of Modern Community*, representing the results of a penetrating investigation of an American City community of about 17,000 people. It brought out the fact that even in that small community there were at least 357 associations (groups) and that the 6,874 individuals, whose membership of associations was studied, provided the total of 12,876 memberships. Of these 6,874 persons (0.50 per cent) were members of more than 10 associations, 1.48 per cent of 7 to 9 associations, 8.40 per cent of 4 to 6, 32.15 per cent of 2 to 3 associations and the remaining 57.47 per cent were members of only 1 association. The class-wise membership of associations of the persons revealed that associations "with members from three or four different classes accounted for the majority or almost two-thirds of the associations and over three-fifths of all members."<sup>39</sup>

James S. Coleman<sup>40</sup> has quoted from other works of Warner showing that in the forties an Illinois town of 6000 had 133 "adult voluntary organizations" and a New England town of 17,000, 800 of them.

The high number of interlocking memberships, overlapping class, and the ramification of individual memberships fit the diagrammatic representation made by Eliot twenty years earlier which is mentioned above. The data also substantiate my submission that a society is an integrate of groups and of their individual members. In this case only the voluntary groups, the multiplicity of which is a peculiarity of modern society, are considered. The action and reaction of members and different aims and purposes of these associations between them enable individuals to internalize a fairly comprehensive picture of the society, on the sub-stratum of the same as conveyed through the involuntary groups and their compulsory memberships.

Kurt Lewin, whose psychological system is known as "group theory" or, alternatively "field theory," the group being, as Allport informs the readers of Lewin's book *Resolving Social Conflicts*<sup>41</sup> the unifying theme of it. Lewin, controverting the opinion of "some of the sociologists" who "said that only the social group has reality and that the individual person is nothing more than an abstraction", asserting that "groups are sociological wholes" whose unity can be defined "by the inter-dependence of its parts" and are "more than or different from the sum of their members." He upholds my submission of the individual getting into touch with his society through groups when he affirms that "during most of his life the adult acts not purely as an individual but as a member of a social group."<sup>42</sup>

R. M. MacIver's first endeavour at formulating "social science" or "socio-

<sup>39</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 303, 333, 349.

<sup>40</sup> *Community Conflict*, 1957 or 1958, p. 21.

<sup>41</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. VII, 71, 73, 84, 184.

<sup>42</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 146.

logy" took the shape of the book entitled *Community* published in 1917, though written in 1914. He was then a Britisher and remained such till he had to take out the third edition of the book in 1924 and its reprint in 1928<sup>43</sup> under the same title. But he had already become a professor of Political Science in the Canadian University of Toronto. His preface to the third edition makes his orientation towards and reception of American sociological studies quite clear.

In this book MacIver showed himself to be an enthusiastic proponent of universal brotherhood, delivering his final judgement and firm conviction on this matter in these plain words: "From the point of view of the sociologist the internal progress of any particular group or community is necessarily partial in so far as it does not bring that group or community into complete harmony, with others . . . when men realise that their own country is but a part of the meaning of community all the broken social interests of today will be revealed as *co-ordinated* with the '*universitas humana*.'" Elaborating on the possibility and existence of "social conflict" he stated:

. . . the conflict between the claims of the nearer and the wider circle *becomes transformed into a certain harmony*" on "*a true recognition of the relation of the narrower to the wider circle* . . . a recognition of the inter-dependence and ultimate oneness of social values.

Similarly within a nation-community: "when the barriers of locality and class are broken across the recognition and establishment of wider common interests, the nation or people emerges as an *integral* community". Writing specifically of the American nation-community in this context, MacIver had to think of both immigrant communities and racial groups of different cultures within it. But characteristically, both as in the individual personality approach as also in the perspective of the communal scene of race-riots, which occurred during World War I, the sanguine attitude and the complacent front assert themselves and he affirms: "The unity of the American nation, built out of the fragments of many and diverse peoples, and under the diverse conditions of a broad continent, is the most signal proof of the reality of *social assimilation*." Such sanguine and almost blind-to-the-situation-view of so acute a social analyst must drive home to any reader the fact that "sociology" had, till the dinning of the Negro-White relations problem into the American ears had reached a proper volume, remained almost impervious to its repercussions on the nature of community and of nation-community in particular!

Being almost a religious enthusiast for one world-community like Wendell Wilkie,<sup>44</sup> Franklin Roosevelt's rival for American Presidentship, Mac-

<sup>43</sup> Pp. 260-72, 275-6, 298-9, 327-330. Italics mine.

<sup>44</sup> *One World*.

Iver about a decade or so later, spoke of "federalism" as the *modus operandi* of coordination of the larger community whether of localities or of nations. And the term "federal" was meant to describe "*the general relation of local to national autonomy*, though this term is commonly limited to the relation of part-States to a greater inclusive State." He points out further that the difference between the two connotations of the term lies principally in this that the units of federated States or part-States "retain a partial sovereignty". Within the unitary State "*the locality rarely represents an integral body of opinion vitally opposed to the policy of the rest of the country*" except where "either historically or through uncontrolled immigration, there are islands of racially distinct peoples", a state that "*does at times occur in the relations of part states to a federation*". Naturally he draws his illustrations from the United States of America. Without going into further details of distinction I emphasize the fact that MacIver, coming so close to the "cultural autonomy" doctrine of Bauer-Renner in the case of Austria-Hungary, put up some few years before MacIver, and the later notion of "national federalism" of Janowsky in relation to national, racial or linguistic religious minorities of Europe, did not explore its potentialities for the Negro-White or immigrant problem of the U.S.A. For as the quotation shows he saw nothing but achieved, or in the process of being achieved, assimilation in their case! But we may expect him to extend the application of his "federal" remedy to that problem when a few years later it had made itself insistent and produced a few special books beginning with that of Donald Young.

In 1931 MacIver, then Lieber Professor of Political Philosophy and Sociology at Columbia University, gave us in his *Society, Its Structure and Changes*,<sup>45</sup> "a system of Sociology", significantly having given up the title of his earlier book, viz., "Community" for "Society", and defined society as "a system of social relationships", more or less in the words used by L. T. Hobhouse in his article on Sociology in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. If society is a system of social relationships, community stands for the people who are thus related, living together, "belonging" together, sharing "a whole set of interests wide enough and complete enough to include their lives" and "not this or that particular interest". He definitized the concept by adding that "*a community is always a group occupying a territorial area*". State is an association and not "the whole community"; "nationality" on the other hand is "*one type of community sentiment*" and "*the nation is the largest effective community*", i.e., "*the nation is the largest group which is permeated by the consciousness of comprehensive solidarity*". And if one wants to know what is "community sentiment" here is MacIver's answer: "*The sense of what they have in common—memories and traditions, customs and institutions—informs and defines the general*

<sup>45</sup> Pp. vii, 9-10, 13, 61, 65, 69, 73-77, 167-70, 178-82, 185-90, 350-54; 400-405. Italics mine.

*impulse of man to live together, establishing the community sentiment*". About further extension he is quite positive that "there is *as yet no international community in any effective degree*". This view enables him to offer us the pithy statement about "nationalism" that it "*is the spirit which seeks to make the nation an effective unity*" which for our topic is quite germane. Though MacIver had, in fact, travelled far and wide, his treatment of the subject was very brief and devoid of that universal-brotherhood-charged climate which we breathe in his earlier "federalism", and co-ordination as the principle of extension of community to universal limits drops off!

"Co-ordination" of the earlier treatise is almost absent in the new system of sociology. On the other hand conflict within the community is seen in its potentially destructive aspect, and *solidarity* is, over and again but quite logically stressed, and its engendering is studied. And it is in connection with the threat that solidarity has to encounter that MacIver introduces racial groups and antagonisms centering round them, beginning with the "long established" and even "half-submerged" minorities of Europe like the Swedes and the Finns in Finland and the Flemish and the Walloons in Belgium.

The situation in the field of sociological analysis which upholds my submission that concepts of conflict and tension, and later that of integration, began to receive adequate recognition from American Sociologists, after a fair amount of din was created by the special literature on race-riots or Negro-White relations that began to be issued since 1932, is represented by MacIver's use of the American scene to illustrate "communal solidarity". He affirms quite correctly that "the American continent offers peculiar opportunities for the study of the manner in which the growth of communal solidarity embracing groups of diverse origin and national characteristics is advanced or retarded". In partially describing the phenomena MacIver uses the verb "integrate" and its opposite "disintegrate" and asserts that "*the solidarity of a community depends not on the absence of differences within it but rather on the absence of certain barriers to the liberation and the consequent modification or adjustment of these differences*".

Another change consequent on the difference in orientation is that "federalism" of the earlier treatise assumed the milder form of "the federative principle" and evoked rather low enthusiasm even in its sponsor, the author of *Society, Its Structure and Changes*. Side by side we are introduced to a new variety of agreement-creating process, destined henceforward to come more and more to the front and occupy the central position and to be the focal point of social endeavour, sectional, regional, national or international, viz., "integration". It comes in the wake of a study of primary group and its internal working.



In his *Society, a Textbook of Sociology*, issued in 1937, Professor MacIver retained his lukewarm "federative principle" in the context only of groups and large scale organization and also the identical group-working chart.<sup>46</sup> But though associations, both great and small, are recognized there is nothing about social groups. Class and Caste are there; the herd and the crowd, too, get their due; but ethnic or racial groups are conspicuous by their absence, though race is treated.

All this is markedly changed in the later text-book entitled *Society, an Introductory Analysis*, a joint work of Professor MacIver and Dr. Page. It is not only "society", "community" and "associations" that receive the honour of being treated as primary concepts at the outset of the book but also "group", it being defined as "any collection of social [?] beings who enter into distinctive social relationships with one another."<sup>47</sup> This definition is only a variation in terms of social relationship, which as we know from Professor MacIver's definition of Society to be his favourite concept, of what others did in terms of interdependence. The importance of group for the formation or inculcation of attitudes by individuals is affirmed in the pregnant words: "*there is a tendency in every social group to develop like attitudes towards interests relevant to the group as a whole! Attitudes very responsive to the large apparatus of suggestion that is part of the formal and informal educational system of all groups*". And attachment of an individual to his social group is emphasized by christening it as "loyalty to an ingroup". *Inter alia* the authors record various groups within a nation, mentioning "ethnic groups", "culture groups", "interest groups". They go much further than Professor Robert Angell in estimating the probable dangers to social and national solidarity, arising out of the multitude of groups and assert that they "often gravely damage, through their tensions and their conflicts, the unity and the well-being of the whole". In harmony with the view of the importance of group to an individual's attitudes they present a Chart (No. IV) showing the codes of various groups and the sanctions which support the codes. A whole Chapter (10) is headed "Types of Social Groups" and contains both the earlier definition of "group" and an elaborate classification which is conveniently presented in Chart VII.

The ethnic, race-conscious or racial groups, it deserves to be noted, receive the treatment at length. The immigrant groups are discussed in Chapter VI in connection with the social processes of accommodation and assimilation. Racial groups came in for some notice in connection with the concepts of community and communal solidarity (pp. 305-09), and they and ethnic groups together get a special Chapter (No. 15) to themselves. An ethnic group is defined as one "whose members share a distinctive social and cultural tradition maintained within the group

<sup>46</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 240-50.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 70-74, 156, 162, 222-5.

from generation to generation".<sup>48</sup>

The importance of groups was further emphasized by Florian Znaniecki who observed in 1950-51<sup>49</sup> that "*national solidarity and international conflicts are not individual, but group phenomena, and they can be explained only by a comparative study of social groups*". A little later<sup>50</sup> he vouchsafed, from an unpublished thesis, the significant information that out of the fortyeight American textbooks on Sociology published between 1932 and 1949 "eleven had no classification of groups whatsoever; the other thirtyseven differed so much that not a single logical class was included in all of them". Such was more or less the state in which the concept of group stood in the view of American Sociologists till about 1954. And to judge by the place occupied by it in such books as Professor Kingsley Davis' *Human Society*, even in its 17th printing in 1964, one would think that it was no better even in 1960 or 1963. But turning to Professor Harry M. Johnson's *Sociology* (1960-63) one comes across a welcome change and finds that though groups are not properly classified or enumerated, Sociology itself is pronounced to be "the science that deals with social groups".

Some of the Political Scientists, especially those like James S. Coleman, concerned with African societies, have gone ahead with the treatment of the concept of group. Coleman and Carl G. Rosberg in their book *Political Parties and National Integration in Tropical Africa* (1964) have defined the concept and also given us their classification of groups. They define group as "any aggregate of persons [and here Society differs from group for the former has to be an integrate though the latter can afford to remain an aggregate], whether formally associated or not". For their purposes they have divided groups into three classes: (1) "Political Parties"; (2) "Interest Associations"; and (3) "Categoric groups". Categoric groups are such "demographic" units as "chiefs", "students", "clerks", "teachers", "lawyers", etc. Each one of them is such that the persons grouped under each "may or may not share a common outlook or organize a formal association to assert and protect their presumptively common interests". Political parties are a well-understood category. Interest associations, like all associations as such in the view of Sociologists, are organized groups and seek to protect and further the consciously formulated, and to a very large extent shared, interests of their members. They recognize three sub-classes in them: (a) General (b) Specific and (c) Ideal. Under the former sub-class figure groups which are "communal", "racial", "tribal". Under the "specific" sub-class we have the "occupational or professional",

<sup>48</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 14, 26, 33.

<sup>49</sup> *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1950-51, p. 219.

<sup>50</sup> Morroe Berger and others *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, 1954, pp. 175-6.

"ideal or material".<sup>51</sup>

In the same year as that of the publication of Coleman and Rosberg's above-mentioned book, Professor Robert Angell returned to his old favourite topic of "group" and "integration". Concerning himself with studying differences in the internalized values in the two societies, those of the U.S.S.R. and of U.S.A., Angell selected forty values or "value categories" or "value dimensions" as he calls them and in order to get at the internalization of these in the two societies he evoked responses to them from certain common groups of elite from both societies. In justification and validation of his method of getting responses from certain identical groups from the two societies he voices his confidence in the representative nature of the groups in the observation: *"If there are common values among the members of groups, and if these groups are powerful in society, then these common values constitute significant data for an understanding of how that society acts and will act."*<sup>52</sup>

The six groups of elites Professor Angell took up are: (1) the military, (2) the scientific, (3) the cultural, (4) the labour, (5) Government service, business and legal professions, and (6) the economic. Of course, the groups are not the groups that Sociologists or even Political Scientists enumerate in their studies but they give us an idea of the probable Sociological classification of groups.

The importance of the group concept is thus fully recognized. As earlier stated, our view of society and therefore of social tensions necessitated our excursion into the concept of group; and our justification is the light it throws on the nature of individual's internalization of the image of his society, not to mention the weighty authority of Professor MacIver who has dubbed modern society a multi-group society. The nature of groups of modern societies, most of them being voluntary organizations, further led us to conclude that their role is very significant in socializing the individual by breaking him in, so to say, to his society.

The interlocking membership of multifarious groups besides its above function helps in rounding off the corners of individuals and disburdening them of some prejudices at least. This role of groups in society may justly be termed integrative. These features of groups received, as already mentioned, the best diagrammatic representation from Eliot, many years ago.<sup>53</sup> The Political Scientist, Hans J. Morgenthau has given an excellent, though succinct, word-picture of the role of groups in society, and the consequences flowing from their membership to individuals and to the society at large. Expounding the nature and growth of suprasectional loyalties of individuals Professor Morgenthau<sup>54</sup> begins by stating the fact,

<sup>51</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>52</sup> *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1964, pp. 330-333. Italics mine.

<sup>53</sup> *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1920.

<sup>54</sup> *Politics among Nations*, (3rd ed.) 1963, pp. 502-4.

already stressed here, of national societies having a multiplicity of social groups. That some of these may be or even must be "antagonistic to each other" in one sense, i.e., in so far as "their respective claims are mutually exclusive" is emphasized. He emphasizes the existence of mutual exclusiveness as characterizing particularly the economic sphere and adds: "Political parties, religious denominations, racial groups, regions and localities meet in similar context." Then he expounds the social mechanism through which the "conflicts" arising from exclusivist and even antagonistic claims are prevented from deteriorating into violence. And here in this sphere lies the contribution of the interlockingly multifarious group-membership of individuals.

Professor Morgenthau takes two citizens A and B. One is a member of economic group E and the other that of E1. The former is also a member of the religious group R, of the political group P, and of the ethnic cultural group C, and let me add of the professional vocational group V and of the socio-recreational group S. The latter, on the other hand, belongs to only some of the identical ones but to others than the remaining ones, where he meets quite different individuals. They in turn meet some others in some of their groups so that there is almost a regular ramification of contacts. All this and much more Professor Morgenthau generalizes thus:<sup>55</sup>

This pluralism of domestic [national] groupings and conflicts tend to impress upon the participants the relativity of their interests and loyalties and thus to mitigate the clashes of different groups. *This pluralism brings about, as it were, an economy in the intensity of identification, which must be spread wide in order to give every group and conflict its share.*

While the *italicized* portion of Morgenthau's pregnant remark expresses or justifies what I call the integrative role of groups, the whole statement leads us on to the consideration of conflict, which like tension, is a personal, an inter-personal and also an inter-group phenomenon.

Allen D. Grimshaw reviewing Robin M. William's book *Strangers Next Door* in 1964 wrote:<sup>56</sup> "So long as groups and collectivities operate as distinct entities and compete for scarce values, a basis for conflict exists even if there were in the world no 'sick' individuals or 'sick' societies." Just a little over a century before Malthus, the Socio-Economist, and Charles Darwin the father of the Evolution idea taking his cue from him, had asserted the persistence of struggle for existence i.e., conflicts between individuals and even more among groups, and the latter had implied or affirmed the beneficial evolutionary effects of the struggle for

existence. This shows a rather rare continuity of a sociological proposition and establishes its claim to profound consideration.

Park and Burgess, writing in 1921,<sup>57</sup> i.e., at least four years before Spykman gave us the first full statement of George Simmel's sociological system in English\*, evidently drawing upon Simmel's contribution, counted "conflict" among the four types of social interaction which they distinguish the remaining three being competition, accommodation and assimilation. They also spoke of the four together as social processes, associating with each a corresponding "social order". The corresponding "social orders" are (i) equilibrium, associated with competition, (ii) the political order with conflict, (iii) social organization with accommodation and (iv) personality and cultural heritage with assimilation. As I am concerned here only with conflict and as assimilation will be impinging upon us in the next section, I shall leave accommodation, which appears to me outmoded with the coming in of "integration", with the observation that if accommodation is "the natural issue of conflicts" as Park and Burgess<sup>58</sup> say it is, then to associate a whole independent and inclusive order with it as they do is not proper.

Park and Burgess<sup>59</sup> further inform their readers that Simmel in his study of conflict distinguished four types: (i) war, (ii) feud and friction, (iii) litigation and (iv) discussion. They added that at least one more type, the varied forms of sport, "in which conflict assumes the form of rivalry" and are nevertheless organized on a conflict pattern, must be recognized.

Professor E. A. Ross<sup>60</sup> of Wisconsin brought out his *Principles of Sociology* hardly a year before Professor R. E. Park of Chicago collaborated with Burgess to produce the book with which I began my treatment of the topics of this chapter and in 1924 a briefer and rearranged edition of it under the title *Outlines of Sociology*. He brought out an enlarged and revised edition of his *Principles of Sociology* in 1930. In the preface to the revised edition he informs us—I have no means of checking up as the 1920 first edition of the book is not available to me—of the omissions and additions he made in the 1930 edition. From the chapters named in the preface it is known that of the 16 additional chapters as many as seven are "conflict" chapters. Their headings are: The Conflict of Ages [Age-Conflict], Race Conflict, Town Country [Community] Conflict, Intra-Class Conflict, Industrial Conflict, Sectarian Strife [Religious Conflict] and Conflict between Learned and Ignorant. In his *Outlines* Professor Ross had only three chapters in which conflict as such, and not also opposition and adaptation, was

<sup>57</sup> *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, pp. 507, 511, 513, 515, 574, 579, 639, 722.

\* Some parts of Simmel's sociological thought were placed before the American Sociologists in the very first year of the birth of the *American Journal of Sociology*, by Professor A. W. Small in 1896.

<sup>58</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 665.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 639.

<sup>60</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 149-265.

dealt with. They were headed: Personal Competition, Class Struggle, and Institutional Competition. The 1930 edition of *Principles of Sociology* names one whole part of the book (IV) "Conflict and Adaptation" and has in it, besides the chapters noted above, one on Personal Competition and another on Institutional Competition and a third on Class struggle. We may attribute the treatment of the other areas of conflict to the influence of Simmel's Sociology. Four chapters, three on opposition and one on adaptation, show the continuity of the pre-Simmel period Sociology. Another chapter entitled Estrangement deals with the same subject, the areas covered being the primary group of the family and also some "secondary" groups, and breathes the spirit, however faintly, that of the later treatise of Professor Robert Angell.

Professor Kimball Young,<sup>61</sup> who commends Professor Ross's treatment as "one of the most adequate discussions of various areas of conflict" and like Professor Ross had written on Psychology, speaks in terms of interaction, speaking *also of the Expanding World of Interaction*, and not in those of social processes, though he somehow drags in the expression in his introductory observations. He says about the part of his book in which these phenomena are discussed, devoting a little more than one-fourth of the whole book for it, that it "will discuss the forms of reaction among people which are fundamental to social life, and which as reactions modify and influence the relations of persons to each other and of groups to other groups. In analyzing special social processes we are but examining certain aspects of the largest basic process of interaction itself". It is clear that what Young speaks of as interaction we may better designate as process and thus avoid his action and reaction dichotomy.

Professor Young specifies seven processes: (i) Competition, (ii) Cooperation, (iii) Differentiation, (iv) Conflict, (v) Accommodation, (vi) Stratification and (vii) Assimilation. In final analysis, however, they are reducible to two fundamental "forms of interaction": opposition and cooperation. Opposition gives us two varieties in his view: (a) Competition and (b) Conflict. While out of conflict issues accommodation nothing ensues from either competition or cooperation by itself. Differentiation which is the third social process, Professor Young derives from "opposition and cooperation", though it is very difficult to see why age and sex differentiation must be traced to them. Stratification is the fifth or the sixth social process and is considered to be "a special phase of differentiation and accommodation" so that it is a tertiary or even quaternary and not merely a secondary process, both differentiation and accommodation being themselves secondary and tertiary in Professor Young's scheme. Assimilation, the sixth or the seventh process of the scheme, is said to be arising out of competition, conflict and cooperation. And assimilation is equivalent to "the merging of divergent groups or persons into a new and homogenous group-

<sup>61</sup> *An Introductory Sociology*, 1934, pp. 348, 419.

ing". In his view accommodation must be considered to be a process which may lead to stratification but will not proceed further!<sup>62</sup>

Professor Young's treatment of the social process named "conflict" encompasses all the well-known areas of social and personal conflict. Social conflict is listed as in the following eight areas or as of eight kinds: (i) Industrial, (ii) Racial [ethnic], (iii) Religious, (iv) Political (v) Inter-community and Intra-community, (vi) Inter-class and Intra-class, (vii) Sex and age conflict and (viii) Conflict of intellectual or moral principles. Professor Young has discussed the role of Conflict in personality formation in a fair way but without, surprisingly, any reference to the conflict of the type or types which the new psychology, that created by Psychoanalysis, has introduced.<sup>63</sup>

Professor MacIver in his *Society, a Textbook of Sociology*,<sup>64</sup> (1937) may be said to recognize only two social processes, i.e., co-operation and conflict. For he holds that "society is co-operation crossed by conflict" and also that "cooperation and conflict are universal elements in human life" and treats them at some length. In both processes he recognized two varieties, or rather "levels", viz., *direct* and *indirect*. Though he speaks of "the resolution of conflict" even as regards social conflict his discussion is confined to racial and ethnic conflicts, whether in the U.S.A. or in Central and Eastern Europe. His discussion of interest conflict within Associations pertains of course to intra-group more than to inter-group phenomena and even then is far from convincing or satisfactory. Of the personal, that is intra-personal, conflicts he selects only the conflict with the code.

Professor Robert E. Park returned to the subject of competition and conflict with the onset of the Second World War in his article on "The Social Functions of War" contributed to *The American Journal of Sociology* in 1940-41 (pp. 551-70). His stance towards conflict appears to have changed in the interval. He says that competition may be regarded as "an individualizing or analytic process, conflict as an integrating process".

In this context of "conflict" as an integrating process two observations need to be made in order to enable the reader to appreciate the notional development. While the Psychoanalytic view of conflict generally represented it as dysfunctional or at least divisive and disruptive, Simmel, like Bagehot before him, had brought out the progressive or integrative side of it. Perhaps more important than this was the fact that Miss Mary Follett, who had made a mark as a political thinker by knocking some important planks out of the platform of Political Pluralists of the time like Professor Harold Laski, had already crossed over to the business management field. The social significance of the School of Business Management in general may be gauged from the fact that no less a thinker, a mathematical phi-

<sup>62</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 348, 382, 418, 452, 469, 473, 496.

<sup>63</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 77-102, 447-50.

<sup>64</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 50, 52, 50-57, 264-67, 379-80.

losopher of the first order and a social philosopher of no less stature than Professor A. N. Whitehead delivered lectures at the Harvard Business School in 1931, which later formed Chapter VI of his famous book *Adventures of Ideas*. And the topic of his lecture was "Foresight", what it means in a changing milieu and the need for it.

It was six years before Whitehead lectured at the Harvard Business School that Miss Follett had presented a paper before a Bureau of Personnel Administration Conference group in January 1925. It was entitled "Constructive Conflict" and was printed in *Scientific Foundations of Business Administration* in 1926. Follett<sup>65</sup> says almost at the outset:

I should like to ask you to agree for the moment *to think of conflict as neither good nor bad; to consider it without ethical pre-judgment; to think of it not as warfare, but as the appearance of difference, difference of opinions, of interests. For that is what conflict means—difference.*

We find the integrative role of conflict stressed by Professor Robert Angell,<sup>66</sup> albeit only in a stray manner and as a possibility, in his book *The Integration of American Society* (p. 85). For he observes: "We have insisted that struggle is compatible with integration only when there are agreed standards in terms of which the struggle goes forward."

The British linguist, M. M. Lewis, writing in 1947, devoted two chapters (10 and 11) of his book *Language and Society* to the consideration of the relation between language and social conflict and its resolution, observing that "war without, peace within; peace without, war within" was "the characteristic alternation of society today". He took the problem of the Negroes in the U.S.A., forming as they did then 10 per cent of the entire population—today they form more than 15 per cent—and predicted that the increasing communication, particularly if left to itself and not properly guided, would increase the intensity of the conflict. And "such community works as a double stroke engine", increasing the internal consciousness of both the groups, adding fuel to the fire in the process.

Robin M. Williams<sup>67</sup> defined "conflict" as "a struggle over values (distributive or non-distributive) in which the immediate aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure, or eliminate their rivals"; and added "conflict results from the conscious pursuit of exclusive values". Drawing upon the extant American literature on the subject of group hostility and upon General Psychology Williams notes that individuals "in all known social systems" conceive of themselves as members of some groups, which being classed mentally and behaviourally as "we-groups" create a sort of hostility to



other groups, the "you-groups" or the "not-we groups". Such hostility is the source of group conflict. Frustration whether real or imagined adds fuel to the fire and hardens the nature of conflict. Overt aggression is conditioned by "the strength of instigation to a frustrated goal-response".

Professor Raymond Aron,<sup>65</sup> ten years later, in the UNESCO symposial study *The Nature of Conflict* defined group conflict as the struggle or opposition between two social groups and individuals for the possession of certain goods in short supply or for the attainment of mutually incompatible values. Though the word conscious does not occur in the expressions used we can see that Aron's definition is almost exactly the same as that of Robins.

Professor Kingsley Davis in his very popular<sup>66</sup> book *Human Society*, first published in 1948 or 49, has given to conflict the first place among the three important forms of interaction, conflict, competition and cooperation. He distinguishes partial conflict from total conflict which having "no level of agreement at all" is resolved "through the resort to physical force" and instances war as the "most familiar kind of group conflict". When writing about "internal/[i.e., intra-group] conflict he speaks of "open conflict" being eliminated within any group, "partial conflict", alone being possible. Conflict in family, school, neighbourhood or factory is "an inescapable part of social life" and is of the partial variety. Though Professor Davis distinguishes a variety called "partial" when he comes to deal with competition he speaks of conflict as if it is always of one variety the "total" one. For he contrasts conflict as being aimed at banishing or destroying the opponent with competition which seeks to outdo the competitor and neither to destroy nor to banish him.

The speciality to my mind of Professor Davis' textbook is that it devotes proportionately large space to the treatment of personality, its formation and its dysfunctioning. Socialization of the individual being dealt with only as a part of this section naturally gets too little space and is, so to say, crowded out of its proper place. Especially so is this the case because of the absence of a fairly detailed treatment of groups and their ramification in individual and social life. But the process of personality formation and the consequent picture of an individual member of any society as a purely psychic entity is full in contrast to many text-books on Sociology. It is very welcome. Davis' treatment of this aspect brings out quite clearly the two-fold or rather double role of conflict, viz., (1) conflict as a form of character and conscience and (2) conflict as a dissociative and disruptive element of personality. Self as he points out is not something that exists *ab initio* but is formed "out of social interaction" through

adjustments to new and conflicting situations.<sup>70</sup>

Professor MacIver and his collaborator Page significantly moved, in their book *Society, an Introductory Analysis* (1950), from the position the senior partner had taken up in his book *Society, a Textbook of Sociology* thirteen years earlier. Conflict is given a new variety in the nomenclature "social conflict". Its nature and scope are more openly made out to be "all activity in which men contend *against one another* for any objective" and as "man against man and group against group . . . wherever there is society." It is considered as a form of attitude, indifference and aversion being its earlier stages or less intense aspects. And it is called *positive* or *active* conflict, which expression implies a variety to be named "silent" or "non-active" conflict, which is not quite correct analysis. Personality conflict does not figure in Professor MacIver's treatment. However he manages to draw upon Karen Horney's contribution, even her submission regarding "our inner conflicts", though very much lamely in the context.<sup>71</sup>

Because of older moorings and their conflict with the newer findings the authors harp on the earlier theme of cooperation and conflict being the only two social processes, though in the sequel we shall have occasion to note their recognition and even treatment of two or three other processes as well.

The significant departure from the earlier position of Professor MacIver in regard to conflict is that we have in the new work of post-mid-twentieth century a full-dress debate,<sup>72</sup> so to say, on ethnic and racial groups and the tensions and conflicts that arise out of their presence and activity. Surely the warning uttered by Professor Robert Angell about groups in American society a decade before had been listened to, a fact evidenced by some other symposial or collaborative writings of Professor MacIver during that decade too. Detailing the different patterns seen in the treatment and behaviour of racial and ethnic groups they instance the formation of the Brazilian national community, which has resulted through "emphasis upon the common interest" and "the firm execution of a policy of non-discrimination though other factors, too, may have helped the process. The lineaments of the Brazilian national community in their own words may be described thus: <sup>73</sup> "Not only is there a great deal of biological intermixture in this country but there is an enhancement of communal unity on the one side and of individual opportunity unfrustrated by ethnic lines on the other."

From the psychological point of view conflicts within an individual, the serious ones and the ones which are not fully on the conscious plane of the individual mind, are a charge or a drag on personal energy. We have

<sup>70</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 194-208, 212-3, 263-73.

<sup>71</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 62-70.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter 15.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 391.

come across this view in our section on tensions, where I have referred to the considered views of Kurt Lewin on the subject. Karen Horney has brought out this aspect of the human predicament in her book *Our Inner Conflicts* (1945) in relation to conflicts, the neurotic variety of them and the "unresolved" ones.<sup>74</sup> And she has observed in that connection, expanding Jung's view, that "if a person not compulsively driven struggles hard enough, *he can arrive at some integration*".

We hear echoes of all psychological—in the earlier stages only those of the psychoanalytic school—light on personality in diverse pronouncements about "integrated personality". Thus Professor Hornell Hart<sup>75</sup> regarded "the completed functioning of an integrated personality" as "the goal of progress for the individual."

Paul Diesing,<sup>76</sup> only a few years after, speaks not only of integrated but also of unintegrated systems, assuring his readers that while the former is "resistant to change because it is effective in making action possible", the latter, energy being blocked exerts pressure for random substitute outlets "making it receptive to change". In the integrated system again "alternate goals can be held together without destructive conflict and repression".

Among psychologists defining personality in terms of integration Kempf needs to be singled out. Allport<sup>77</sup> has quoted Kempf's view from a piece of writing published in 1921, in which year Miss Mary Parker Follett brought the notion of integration into Political Science by her use of it in her book *The New State*. And she says: "The essence of the group process is an acting and reacting, a single and identical process which brings out differences and integrates them into a unity. The complex reciprocal action, the intricate interweavings of the members of the group, is the social process." A little later, within half a dozen years, she developed and propagated the notion and its successful application to Business Management. In her paper "The Psychology of Control"<sup>78</sup> presented and published in 1927, she reveals to us the thought influences which inspired her to think of integration and apply it. She states that the contributions of physiologists like Henderson, Cannon and J. B. S. Haldane gave her a view of unities, what they are and how they work. She then speaks of "a very suggestive treatment of wholes" as coming from physiologists like Sir Charles Sherrington "working at the integrative action of the nervous system". And finally she mentions Kempf as the psychobiologist who dealt with "whole personalities", a functional whole being an integrative unity.

Follett asserted<sup>80</sup> that there were only three principal ways of "dealing with" conflict or "difference", viz., (1) Domination, (2) Compromise and (3) Integration. It should be noted neither the psychoanalytic nor the sociological terminology, then current, finds favour with Miss Follett. The former is well known for its techniques of resolution or solution of conflicts which are mostly in the unconscious plane of mind by bringing them up into full awareness of the self, and its insistence on sublimation. The Sociologists, like Park and Burgess and E. A. Ross spoke of conflict as getting solved through accommodation and also finally through assimilation. Of these two social processes accommodation of the Sociologists appears to be the same as "compromise" of Miss Follett. When conflicts are dealt with by "integration" stabilization is the result and they can be truly called constructive.

"By domination only one side gets what it wants; by compromise neither side gets what it wants; by integration we find a way by which both sides get what they wish", says Miss Follett. One can agree with the first two statements and add that the first leaves not only a scar, but an open sore which will sooner or later be running, while the second may or may not effect conciliation of the active variety. It may only result in tolerated coexistence, waiting for an opportunity to get the situation squared up. It is very difficult to see that in every integration, the two sides get what they want. It is only when a third objective, end or value equally covetable to both sides can be brought in, that this would happen. It appears to me that such occasions in inter-group conflicts, especially conflicts centering round minorities, are likely to be rare. Like compromise integration too is a mutuality. Both sides have to move to make it a success. And it is in this particular that integration on the physio psychological plane in the individual and that on the psycho-social plane among the social groups, whether minorities or not, differ from each other.

Miss Follett thus introduced the concept of integration in Political Science and in Business Management during 1921 and 1927, yet Social Science as a whole may be said to have remained impervious to it in America till at least 1931. The great American work, *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, did not contain an article on "Integration" though the 14th edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* carried a small note on it.

This does not mean that Sociologists had never recognized the process and its significance. The great promulgator of Sociology in the English-speaking world, Herbert Spencer, used the concept more than a century ago in his *First Principles*<sup>81</sup> (1862). He asserted that integration along with differentiation were the most important laws of evolution, inorganic, organic and social. In the last aspect he included the whole of Europe as an entity struggling or evolving towards integration. Spencer's connotation of the

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 31, 34-5, 213.

<sup>81</sup> Edition in the Thinker's Library Series, Chap. XIV, p. 282.

term integration is best gathered from his prophesy about Europe's integration. He says:

This process slowly completes itself by destroying the original lines of demarcation. And of the European nations it may be further remarked, that in the tendency to form alliances, in the restraining influences exercised by governments over one another, in the system of settling international arrangements by congresses, as well as in the weakening of commercial barriers and the increasing facilities of communication, we see the beginnings of a European federation—a still larger integration than any now established.

In his 1931 version of his older book under the title *Society, its Structure and Changes*, Professor MacIver introduced the concept of "integration" as a group-process in his formulation of the theory of the primary group. The modus operandi of harmony and consensus or near-consensus in a group of the face-to-face or primary variety forms an important link in our understanding of the socialization of individuals and the kind of personalities with shared experience that are likely to evolve. MacIver,<sup>82</sup>—pondering over the nature of the process and evidently utilizing the thought of Miss Follett, and as it appears from MacIver's note, from others too who being like-minded were then conducting a bulletin in New York to propagate the adherence to the principle of integration—developed a tripple scheme into a quadruple one and presented in a chart entitled "Types of Group Agreement" his conclusions in purely Sociological terms. The fourth of these bases of group agreement is integration. The process by which it is arrived at is "conclusive discussion", the decision represents, or is, "real unanimity" and the differences which are thus dealt with on the basis of integration are "expressed in the process and conserved in the result".

Later in the book Professor MacIver, while discussing social change and progress and some of Herbert Spencer's views on evolution, rather abruptly brings in integration with the remark: "Often it is said that evolution is a process of differentiation *and* integration, but the term *differentiation*, properly understood, connotes integration". He then details the manifestations of differentiation in society, such as division of labour and says nothing about integration. This statement about differentiation and integration is almost verbatim repeated in the 1937 book, entitled *Society, an Introductory Analysis* (pp. 412-13), and in the 1950 conjoint work entitled *Society, a Textbook of Sociology* (pp. 525-28). In their application of the concept of evolution to society, MacIver and Page assert that "to meet our sense of differentiation such complexity or novelty [brought in

<sup>82</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 177-179, 404-06.

by differentiation] must be *integrated* \* within the social structure . . . must contribute to the interrelation of function between the whole and the parts." To conceive of the whole and to keep its requirements in view posits the existence of some agency as in the case, for example, of the human organism.

Sir Charles Sherrington's work brought us a clear understanding of the function of the central nervous system in the human individual, composed of a very large number of differentiated and specialized constituent units. And as stated by the great neurophysiologist himself, that function is the integrative one. So differentiation has to have integration stored up or arranged somewhere to produce an efficient and healthy working. The quotation from Spencer made above abundantly proves the applicability of integration as a complementary of differentiation. Professor Gordon W. Allport,<sup>81</sup> writing in 1938 about growth in an individual, says that "differentiation, as the sole mechanism, would produce a kind of entropy or dissipation of personality" and that "integration is fully as important a principle as differentiation".

Before proceeding further with the story of the introduction of the concept of integration into Sociology as a process and as a condition or the result of the integrative process, it is instructive to know the kind of social process which were recognized by Sociologists. As stated above and also in connection with our discussion of conflict, accommodation was one of them whose lineaments may be inferred from what I have said about it in connection with the "compromise" of Miss Follett's categorization. The other, and from our viewpoint the more important, process is assimilation. Both these concepts received articles to themselves in the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. It stands to reason that assimilation both as a product or condition and as a process should receive academic attention of Sociologists in America.

And we find a paper on "Social Assimilation" in *The American Journal of Sociology*, as early as 1901, by Sarah F. Simons. It was another Jew, Horace M. Kallen, who gave us the next landmark in the study of "assimilation". He published in 1915 his book entitled *Assimilation and Democracy*. The famous phrase "melting pot" was used by an American Jew, Israel Zangwill, in his play in 1906.<sup>82</sup> From 1901 to 1957 at least—I should not be understood to mean that 1957 represents the end of the process—the concept of assimilation has received serious attention of Sociologists.

In our brief appraisal of the academic endeavour it is enough if I begin with Park and Burgess' well-known book *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (1921). Assimilation according to these sociologists is "a pro-

\* Italics mine.

<sup>81</sup> *Personality*, pp. 132-47, 343-45.

<sup>82</sup> Nathan Glazer in *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, 1954 (pp. 158-9) by Morroe Berger and others.

cess of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups, and, by sharing their experiences and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life".<sup>85</sup> From the point of the individual or group that is being assimilated, assimilation involves, as pointed out by these sociologists, "a process of denationalization, and that is, in fact, the form it has taken in Europe".

Professor MacIver brought "assimilation" into his Sociology only in 1931 when, in his *Society, Its Structure and Changes*, he listed assimilation along with accommodation and some items as processes involved in the business of social change. But he did not try to indicate what it was; nor did he bring it in his treatment of man's reaction to his environment where he used the concept of accommodation. Six years later, in his *Society, a Textbook of Sociology*, even with a fairly full appraisal of the position of the immigrant groups in the U.S.A., he stuck to "social accommodation" without bringing in assimilation and in his treatment of social change listed, as earlier, "assimilation" along with other categories.<sup>86</sup> Post-Second World War attitude is reflected in the joint work entitled *Society, an Introductory Analysis*. Speaking of "uneasy partial accommodation" in the case of the Negro in the States, Professor MacIver and his collaborator use the by-then-out-moded expression "melting pot" to describe the situation *vis-a-vis* European immigrant settlers, using of course the concept "assimilation" more than once. They evidently treat assimilation as within accommodation under which caption they assure the readers that "in the more evolved and more complex society, because of the differentiation within it, the complete assimilation of the newcomer to an entire set of community patterns does not take place", introducing the statement in explanation of the caption "accommodation less rigorous in higher civilization". They eschew all reference to assimilation or even accommodation in the whole chapter entitled "Ethnic and Racial Groups" but introduce it, as in earlier books, in the social change context and in precisely casual manner.<sup>87</sup>

Kimball Young,<sup>88</sup> as we have already noticed, counts assimilation among the seven or eight "fundamental processes of interaction" that he recognizes. Assimilation is defined in the same terms as those of Park and Burgess with the addition of the words "of the nation" after "cultural life", which, too, as pointed by Young himself, owes its origin to R. E. Park. Though he equates it with fusion, he shows by his listing of amalgamation as the third stage of the process accommodation, assimilation being the second, that assimilation is short of fusion.

<sup>85</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 734-35. *Society, its Structure and Changes*, pp. 734-35; *Society, a Textbook of Sociology*, pp. 354-55, 402-22.

<sup>86</sup> *Society, its Structure and Changes*, pp. 354-55, 402-22; *Society, a Textbook of Sociology*, pp. 103-13, 406-16.

<sup>87</sup> Pp. 122-34, 523-30.

<sup>88</sup> *An Introductory Sociology*, pp. 419, 495-96.

Milton M. Gordon's contribution to this topic made in 1954 is worthy of a full summary but I shall desist from doing so. After all assimilation is an outmoded approach as will be seen from the sequel. Gordon<sup>89</sup> would distinguish between *behavioural assimilation* and *structural assimilation*, asserting that the latter has not taken place among the immigrant settlers in the United States.

In 1957, Alan Richardson, in *Human Relations*,<sup>90</sup> brought out in clear relief the principle underlying Young's scheme mentioned above. He says that the concept of assimilation enables us to analyze the situation at the socio-psychological level, while absorption [the same thing as amalgamation] states it at the purely sociological level. Ronald Taft, however, the same year in the same journal, drawing inspiration from Park and Burgess, gives us a working definition of social assimilation as "the process whereby as a result of social interaction, a person transfers his membership from one group to a second group whose norms are inconsistent with those of the first". He further adds that the process is most commonly thought of in reference to immigrants though "the same process occurs in almost every area of group relations".

The career of the concept of integration in Sociology may be said to begin with the work of Professor Robert C. Angell. In 1940, he published his book *The Integration of American Society*. His characterization of an integrated society gives his view of the concept of integration though he does not define the concept directly. He says:<sup>91</sup> "No matter how primitive the communication and transportation may be or how economically self-sufficient families are, *if the people are intensely devoted to the achievement of common ends and the realization of common values, there is a highly integrated society*. And conversely, they may live in a most complicated web of technological, economic, and political relations and still not possess an integrated society if they have few common ends and values." He adds in expository words that "*the danger of societal disintegration increases as the number of common values that are accepted declines*". Another and additional essential for integration is common institutions and they must have "*concern for the common welfare*".

Professor Angell followed up his line of thought and research by publishing next year a paper entitled "Social Integration of American Cities".<sup>92</sup> At the very outset of it, he says:

Few sociologists would deny that *the integration of groups and societies is a fundamental phenomena for study*. One of the most important questions we can ask about a human aggregate of any kind is whether

<sup>89</sup> Morroe Berger and others, *Freedom etc.*, pp. 150-2

<sup>90</sup> P. 157.

<sup>91</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 15, 23, 28, 210. Italics mine.

<sup>92</sup> *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1941-42, pp. 574-92. Italics mine.



*the members are closely knit together by a common outlook and common aspirations.*

He further states that there are no satisfactory ways of getting at the common loyalties, nor are there well-established and commonly recognized indices of community spirit. For his purposes he selected the Welfare-effort Index and the Crime Index to assess the social integration of the American cities studied.

This was, as can be seen from the year of the publication of Angell's study, before the European Economic Community came into existence and much before there was talk of and writing on European integration. And the concept of integration may be said to have come of age in Sociology about this time.

M. M. Lewis, a British linguist, approaching the study of language from the social side and drawing upon current psychology in 1947, commented upon the social problem of America, envisaged by Angell, on the linguistic plain. Stating the number of newspapers and journals current in U.S.A., in languages other than English, and noting that in 1940 there were 10 million illiterates there, observed: "As a result, there must be a great deal of functional illiteracy in English", and unwittingly supported Angell from the linguistic side. For in his words "*it is only in the presence of a single common language functionally effective in thought, feeling, and action that it is possible for the United States to be an integrated society*".<sup>93</sup> In a whole chapter (pp. 172-98) entitled "Language and Social Integration", he discussed the integrative functions of language, as those who have read the earlier portion of this chapter should have expected.

Professor Hornell Hart, who in 1928, as stated earlier, had put up the concept of an integrated personality as the ideal of society, published his paper on Mathematical models of political integration, without going into the process or processes whereby integration is achieved, in 1948.<sup>94</sup>

The crucial year, however, announcing the firm establishment of the concept of integration in Sociology was 1950. That year the joint work of Professor MacIver and Page on sociology, entitled *Society, an Introductory Analysis*, introduced the expression "social integration" and continued the repetition of integration as an intra-group process from the earlier works of Professor MacIver. It is in connection with the topic of the relation between the two that the authors tell their readers, as a limitation of the harmony principle, that "social integration is never complete" and is "never totally harmonious".<sup>95</sup> They observe; "Conflicts and clashes, repressions and revolts, are always occurring. Within every group, and between groups, there is an incessant struggle of diverse and opposing interests"

<sup>93</sup> *Language in Society*, p. 61.

<sup>94</sup> "The Logistic Growth of Political Areas" in *Social Forces*.

<sup>95</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 51-5.

and mention the dictatorships of Mussolini and Hitler as having "claimed social integration in the name of 'totalitarianism'." But they are frank enough to affirm that "ruthless and bloody records" of those dictatorships "should be reminders, too, that *the integration of society is not only a mark of man's past development but a goal for which he continues to strive*". It is not a little surprising that though they have devoted a whole chapter to the problems of ethnic and racial groups they have not brought in the concept of integration in their exposition.

The omission is the more intriguing as that very year saw the publication of perhaps the first book to speak of integration in connection with the Negro-Americans. Kinzer's book, entitled *The Negro in American Business, the Conflict between Separatism and Integration*, was published in 1950. David F. Aberle, in his paper "Shared values in Complex Societies", published in 1950 in *The American Journal of Sociology*, gives an acceptable and perhaps an agreed definition of the concept of integration as a condition or state. Says Aberle:

By integration we refer to *the capacity of the society to operate as a somewhat integrated totality, without degeneration into frequent open conflicts, or breakdown into a series of independent smaller systems to mention two types of departure from integration.*

In 1951,<sup>96</sup> in his contribution "The Moral Integration of American Cities", Professor Angell added another dimension to the concept of social integration which was implicit in the notion as applied to persons.

Werner S. Landecker took the final step of forcing the concept of integration on the attention of sociologists by his article entitled "Types of Integration and their Measurement" in *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1950-51. It was only social integration and not personal that Landecker dealt with in his article. Declaring that he will not offer a general definition of social integration, he states four types of social integration and defines them. To determine typology he premised that for "sociological purposes the smallest units of group life are cultural standards on the one hand, and persons and their behaviour, on the other". This premise enabled Landecker to distinguish four varieties of social integration: (1) Integration among cultural standards or "Cultural Integration"; (2) Integration between cultural standards and the behaviour of persons or "Normative Integration". Integration among persons or interpersonal integration is of two varieties; (3) Integration through exchange of meanings or "Communicative Integration"; and (4) Integration through exchange of services or "Functional Integration", which is what the economists call "division of labour".

Functional integration consists in the degree to which there is mutual

interdependence among the units of a system of division of labour. It may or may not foster or help the other varieties of integration; but the other three varieties have a close inter-relation which Landecker has expressed thus:

*The extent to which communication or exchange of meanings, contacts, permeate a group, the degree of its communicative integration, will bear some [close] relation to the integration among its cultural standards [cultural integration] and the integration of conduct with these standards [normative integration].\** Landecker in his paper published in *Social Forces*, 1951-52, made the definitions more explicit.

In one way, therefore, communicative integration appears to be the central core or the pivotal base for the other varieties of integration. And it may be stated as a general proposition about communicative integration that spatial and other contacts make for it and its intensity, while segregation in all forms is a barrier against not only its intensity but even its existence.

In 1954, Milton M. Gordon<sup>7</sup> used the concept of integration in the inter-group relations context at two levels: (1) community integration level and (2) the pluralistic integration level, as he termed the levels. The first, i.e., the community integration level, he points out though sounding "strangely similar to what early proponents of the 'melting pot' [this has been already alluded to earlier in this chapter] may have had in mind" differs from "assimilation" in this that it envisages "refashioning of institutions to proclaim symbolically, equality and the common values which embrace diversity". The pluralistic integration level is, as far as I am able to grasp it, the encouragement of "marginals" to join together and create new sub-systems, which widening in course of time will break down the barriers and make the whole society, as it were, one stream.

In 1959-60, Peter M. Blau contributed two papers dealing with "social integration" so that the concept of "social integration" apart from personal integration, had got thoroughly established in Sociology. In one,<sup>8</sup> he dealt with an individuals' integration in the group, i.e., interpersonal integration, and told us the indices of such. The other contribution of Blau, that in *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1960, is still more important as its title *A Theory of Social Integration* proclaims, though its contents are only a paraphrastic extension of the earlier contribution. The power to attract and the capacity to be approachable as well as the desire to do so among the members of a group determine the integration

of individuals in their groups and the integration of their groups.

William Goode, in 1961, in a paper published in *The American Journal of Sociology*, used the rates of illegitimacy in north-western Europe to ascertain the relations between social integration and cultural integration.

It is a strange yet significant fact that even after Professor MacIver adopted the concept of integration as put forward by Miss Mary Follett in 1921 in her book *The New State*, nobody paid any attention to her fuller exposition of these ideas made only a few years later. But this lack of notice on the part of Political Scientists, after 1941, when Follett's papers were published as a book with the catching title of *Dynamic Administration* edited by Metcalfe and Urwick, is even more surprising. Administration of the dynamic variety has been the crying need of many States during the last half century. It was the din of European integration, forcing the attention of Political Scientists to integration on the international plane, and the most laudable desire to usher in the world community, the "gadfly initiating" and the "beacon luring" in A. N. Whitehead's<sup>99</sup> telling phrase of the latter half of the 20th century, that led many earnest votaries of Political Science in the wake of the concept of integration. Since about 1953, so many of them have written books or papers on the subject that it is impossible to give even the briefest notice to them here. Among them all I find Professor Ernst B. Haas to be one who has condescended to examine Miss Follett's ideas of integration, though full two decades after the publication of the book in which her ideas, as far as she had managed to do, were fully laid out!

Professor Haas<sup>100</sup> defines integration on the international plane as "the process attaining [the state of a "political community" like that of] the "successful nation states," i.e., as the process by which "political actors" in several national fields are led to "shift their loyalties, expectations and political activities towards a new and larger centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states." Any conflict on the international plane involves a negotiating process in which three types of compromise, "each indicative of certain measure of integration" are seen. They are (1) "Accommodation on the basis of the minimum common denominator"; (2) "Accommodation by splitting the difference" which "carries a little farther along the path of integration" and (3) accommodation "on the basis of deliberately or inadvertently upgrading the common interests of the parties." He tells his readers further that this last type of compromise is "closest to the peaceful change procedures of typical of a political community" and that it is integration accor-

<sup>99</sup> *Adventures of Ideas*, Chapter II, section V.

<sup>100</sup> *International Organization* 1961, pp. 366-92. Haas in the paper is concerned with the lessons that may be drawn for International integration from a decade of European integration.

ding to Mary Follett. He quotes in support her statement (*Dynamic Administration* p. 32) that integration signifies "that a solution has been found in which both desires have found a place, that neither side has had to sacrifice anything."

Professor Haas in his later work *Beyond the Nation State* (1964)—where he is wholly concerned with the endeavour of promoting the cause of international integration and world community through it, and where he draws upon Sociology both Functional and Historical—naturally deals with integration every now and then. It is not possible here to draw together his threads. For his integration is international and the integration I am concerned with is intra-nation or national integration and not international. I shall state here that he follows his earlier treatment of the concept and his appraisal of Miss Follett's notion of it and applies it to the international field.<sup>101</sup>

Of the other important viewpoint provided by this eminent Political Scientist in his work, leaving out his valid criticism of Professor Karl W. Deutsch's idea of the concept of integration and his application of it, I shall mention his disapproval of the Economist's view of integration and record the points in his implied approval of at least one Sociologist's treatment of the concept, though both move evidently on the international plane. The sociologist concerned, Amitai Etzioni, is not prepared to grant that international law and the UN together establish the fact of international or world integration, though he is prepared to accept the empirical establishment of integration "when among several states one agency disposes of a monopoly over the means of violence, occupies the center in decision making, and constitutes the central focus for the emotional identification of the population of the several states".<sup>102</sup>

Etzioni is perfectly right; for, in the case of a nation-state, what constitutes its integration or rather full integration, which turns it into a community, is this emotional identification of the people with their nation-state. That is, it is the psychological integration combined with the physico-political integration that bespeaks the integrated condition of a nation-state.

If Economists' view of integration is defective, as Haas points out, the cause lies in the nature of economic rationality which, as Paul Diesing<sup>103</sup> convincingly makes out, is not only quite different from social rationality but is actually opposed to it. The contrast, therefore, between economic rationality and social rationality is simply stated by Diesing to be one "between economic and an integrative approach", in facing attitude to and treatment of friendship. He says:

<sup>101</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 109-12.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27. Italics mine.

<sup>103</sup> *Reason in Society*, pp. 14-5, 17, 21, 25-7, 65, 75, 84-5, 87, 95, 117, 143, 236-37.

A person with foresight [of the economic rationality] will not invest too much affect in friends and relatives because they cannot be transferred, but will cultivate more temporary attachments that are painlessly lost and more easily replaced. From an integrative standpoint, however, friendships are unique and irreplaceable.

Paul Diesing states that in social systems left to themselves the integrative trend is universal and that it is only equilibrium that puts it in abeyance. Both these concepts he classes as "developmental trends" and adds that two other trends, that of social stratification and of authority distribution, are better treated as legal trends.<sup>104</sup>

The great difference in the vogue of the concept of integration among Political Scientists and Social Philosophers writing after 1953, and those who wrote before, is best brought to one's notice when one reads the excellent dissertation entitled *Nationalism*, including in it a competent and instructive account of its rise and development in Europe, given to the reading public by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in 1939, and the very interesting and thought-provoking pronouncements of Reinhold Niebuhr in his book *Nations and Empires*, published two decades after it. This difference is further proved to be a trend by the use of the concept of integration made by Professor Robert E. Scott in his illuminating study "Nation-building in Latin America", forming part of the book *Nation-Building* brought out in 1963 by Professor Karl W. Deutsch and his colleague.

The use of this concept in its earlier meaning in the U.S.A. in the case of desegregation law is quite understandable. As far back as 1954, the Supreme Court gave its ruling on what constituted integration as far as Negroes are concerned vis-a-vis the schools in the U.S.A.<sup>105</sup>

That Niebuhr's use of the concept in his *Nations and Empires* registered the first great step forward in this direction is rendered plausible—almost certain—by the great contrast one notes in Professor Deutsch's own usage between 1953 and 1963. Deutsch in his *Nationalism and Social Communication*, concerned with studying and unravelling "the objective as well as the subjective sides of nationality", dwells on the "long-run trends of national assimilation or differentiation". He speaks of integration only rarely and that too in relation to the wider community of the international variety. Towards the end he mentions "national or supra-national integration" and tells us that some of the mappings of concrete data done in his text, showing interdependence and overlapping, "promise to shed light on some of the conditions and prospects" of it. On the other hand, his essay entitled "Some Problems in the Study of Nation-Building", which forms the introduction to the book edited by him under

the title of *Nation-Building*, covering only sixteen pages of less than octavo size, the word "integration" with or without qualifying adjective and the verb "integrate" and its past-participle occur not less than twelve times. Integration is "political" six times and "national" at least thrice.

Professor Robert Scotts' contribution speaks of both physical and psychological integration. Carl J. Friedrich, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government at Harvard, in the same book, so far identifies "unifying and integrating" on the one hand and "nation-building" on the other, that he ends his brief but stimulating essay with the two queries: "Are not the men who are unifying and integrating [or rather integrating and unifying?] Europe engaged in the task of 'nation building' just as much as is Nehru or those who try to weld tribes into nations? Once this idea is clearly understood, is it so very surprising that England and France, those countries in which the nation-state of old was most deeply rooted, should also have the greatest difficulty in overcoming their reluctance to being merged in a more comprehensive group?"<sup>106</sup>

Professor James S. Coleman and Carl G. Rosberg gave us in 1964 what I think was the first book to carry the expression "national integration" in its title, their book being entitled *Political Parties and National Integration in Tropical Africa*. They state that the concept of "national integration" has a variety of meanings and define it for their own purpose as a broad subsuming process with two major dimensions which are styled (1) "political integration" and (2) "territorial integration". While assessing the value of their distinction we have to bear in mind the fact that in Africa the territorial integration was a very important factor, the continent having been parcelled out very arbitrarily under colonial dispensation.<sup>107</sup> Coleman and Rosberg say that "territorial integration" has for its end "the progressive reduction of cultural and regional tensions and discontinuities on the horizontal plane", while "political integration" aims at "the progressive bridging of the elite-mass gap on the vertical plane". Whatever the logic of their distinction for their treatment of the subject, I do not see that the logic is compelling enough to make us accept the distinction even for Africa as a whole and certainly not for national integration elsewhere. Rupert Emerson, Professor of Government at the Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, who published his book, dealing with Colonial African break-up, entitled *From Empire to Nation* in 1960, writing on the subject of "nation-building in Africa", tells us that African leaders are reconciled, at least for the time being, to look upon the "colonies-turned-states" as the states which they have to turn into nations.<sup>108</sup>

<sup>106</sup> *Nation-Building* by Deutsch and Foltz, p. 32.

<sup>107</sup> Rupert Emerson in *Nation-Building* by Deutsch and Foltz, p. 110.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 103-4.

Professor Philip E. Jacob<sup>103</sup> adopting Professor Leon N. Lindberg's categorization of integration based on a thorough examination of the situation in the European Economic Community, states the following four conceptions as forming its facets: (1) Integration as a political unification; (2) Integration as economic unification; (3) Integration as economic and political cooperation; and (4) Integration as free trade.

As a finale to this narration of views on the concept of integration culled from the writings of some of the most eminent of Political Scientists of today, may be cited the definition of it recently given by Richard W. Van Wagenen, who says,<sup>110</sup> apropos to his description of a security community, that the State or condition of integration is "*the attainment of a sense of community*, accompanied by formal or informal institutions and practices, sufficiently strong and widespread to assure peaceful change among members of a group with 'reasonable' certainty over a 'long' period of time".

National integration as a condition or a state is this sense of community felt by the citizens belonging to whatever groups as primary or secondary units, beyond and transcending their sense of loyalty and/or community to these intermediate organizations, for the whole group of the nation-state. The process by which this condition of solidarity is attained is the whole complex of technique called integration. Its components are two: first, political integration which includes in it both (a) territorial integration, and (b) economic integration. Territorial integration is the unification of all the areas which geographically and, so to say organically, belong together, leaving no gaps or areas in between which would hinder free flow of transportation and communication under whatever authority the government or the administration of the nation-state may place it. Economic integration follows the course of this territorial or physical integration, bringing all aspects of the economic activity of the whole people under the common administration that are necessary to be so administered for the welfare of the whole.

I should designate the second component social integration, meaning by it integration of the groups and individuals so that the individuals have common shared values. This social integration is based on, or is the consequence of, psychological integration which comes about through communicative integration as Landecker has named it. Through communication individuals are brought into close contact with common values which transcend those of any and all groups within and even outside the nation-state. This establishes emotional identification of individual citizens with the ideal totality represented by the nation-state. I have called the whole complex social integration because it is the political



aspect, the administrative unity and political participation in it of the individual citizens which is political integration, and in combination with it which makes up the whole complex commonly designated as national integration.

## CHAPTER

## 2

### SOCIAL TENSIONS AND MINORITIES

Some democratic states have exhibited such pluralistic tendencies that they offer to the world a picture of near-anarchy. They seem to speak to the world with many and conflicting voices and to act as if one hand—agency or faction—does not know what the other hand is doing . . . [In] some . . . new . . . states *integration is so poor that other states must deal with parts*, rather than with a fictitious whole, if diplomacy is to be effective.\*

ARNOLD WOLFERS

SOCIAL TENSIONS on the score of language or those that have been seen to arise in relation to some of the minorities have produced violent activity destructive for the time at least, of the sense of cohesion and unity as of one nation among the groups involved in the process. Linguistic tensions, pure and simple, or, as usual, with the addition of the regional factor, have, for the most part, turned out to be temporary at least in the intensity that leads to violent action. Sections of the Indian people speaking a certain language and desiring to see themselves grouped with others of like language as one State or, in case such grouping is physically impossible, eagerly seeking to preserve their linguistic identity in the midst of a section of the Indian people speaking another language, have shown, and, I think will for some years, show their wrath at not getting what facilities they want for that purpose, in violent action. They complain and will go on complaining, not infrequently unreasonably, about their so-called plight. They make and will make rather wild allegations, about the bad treatment received, to the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities. But all the same they are, by and large, not so imbued with the spirit of separation as to take recourse to continued agitation or frequent violent action. In their case and because of the nature of their case, such minorities have been guaranteed such conditions as are likely to satisfy a reasonable person, who is an Indian, to accept them as satisfactory.

All this makes linguistic tensions a disparate phenomenon and not a

\* Arnold Wolfers, *Theoretical Aspects of International Relations*, 1959, p. 102. Italics mine.

cumulative one presenting itself as the evil genius working on the all-India national plane.

These linguistic minorities, are groups speaking different languages but included in a State whose official language is different from theirs. It may be pointed out for facility of comprehension that there are only twelve languages out of those mentioned in the VIIIth Schedule of the Constitution India, which can bring in linguistic States. A group of this type may exist in one, two, three, or perhaps in even four States having four different official languages, the language of the group itself forming the official language of another State. Thus a linguistic group or minority—the Constitution, using the expression as “section of the citizens” in Art. 29(1) specifies such a group by the term “linguistic minority” in Arts. 30(1), (2), 350 and 350(B) and linguistic minority group in Article 350(A)—is very likely to have a State which takes a good deal of external interest in its status and conditions as a component of the State in which the group happens to be located as a minority.

Following the lead of Dr Iris L. Claude,<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor of Government at Harvard University, I should designate such a State a kin-State, as contrasted with the State in which exists the linguistic minority, of whose interests the kin-State is solicitous. This latter State, again in line with the above-mentioned author's terminology, may be called the host-State. Besides a kin-State, there may be more or less well organized linguistic groups and regions which, availing themselves of the provisions of the Constitution, may have declared certain languages, tongues or dialects, which are not listed in the VIIIth Schedule, as their mother tongues. And they may be dispersed in some one or more host states. And they, too, may behave as kin-States. All these States, regions or groups are and will be interested to make representations, truthful or exaggerated, in favour of their linguistic kin-groups.

Second, such a linguistic minority is not at all likely, at present at least, to be present in all the linguistic or other States of the Indian Union. A particular linguistic group, Assamese for example, as a linguistic minority is not an all-India phenomenon but a definitely regionally confined one, two or three States at the best being concerned with it.

There are languages, the groups speaking which, however, have not, and cannot possibly have in the near future, a linguistic State outside of which its speakers form a minority in one or more other linguistic States: viz., Urdu, and Sindhi. Speakers of Urdu are an all-India minority and also a minority in every State where they occur.

Urdu, is a language mostly of Muslims, nurtured by Muslims, and championed, for almost a century, as their mother tongue by the Muslims. Urdu-speakers thus may be equated with Muslim Indians. And Muslim Indians are a religious minority as well.

The Constitution of India in its provisions recognizes minorities based on language or religion, and, by implication, those based on both in combination. It, however, speaks of "any section of the citizens . . . having a distinct language, script or culture of its own", but not of any cultural minority or minority based on culture, and guarantees to it by Article 29(1) "the right to conserve the same". At least in four other Articles the word minority occurs, in two of which, Article 30(1) and 30(2), it is specified as "based on religion or language". In other two, Article 350 and 350(B)(1), we have the mention of "linguistic minority groups" and "linguistic minorities". It is thus clear that for the Constitution of India minorities based on culture or race or "nationality" are non-existent, they being based only on language or religion and by implication on both in combination.

Muslim Indians, the speakers of Urdu, having a distinct religion of their own, are a minority in India which is based on language and religion combined. The other minority that occurs to one's mind, when one thinks of minorities in India, are the Christian citizens. They have a distinct religion of their own but they cannot be said to have a distinct language of their own. Many of them in the different parts of India speak the language of the State in which they are born and bred. English, therefore, cannot be said to be the language of Christian Indians.

The distinction between certain kinds of minorities—and it should be emphasized that neither racial, ethnic nor national minority is recognized by the Constitution of India—differentiating them from "any section of the citizens having a distinct language, script or culture" requires, for its full comprehension at least a brief survey of the notion of "minority", and the setting, in which the concept arose and the treatment which it and the concrete minorities have received elsewhere. Quite often Muslim Indians, holding conference or convention, have posed to figure for Muslims and "other minorities" or have asked other "minorities", among which they have almost invariably counted the Sikhs, to work up. So recently as the third or the fourth week of May 1966 the Christian Indians, too, who, to my knowledge, since the dawn of independence, had hardly ever spoken of themselves as a minority, led a deputation to the Prime Minister of India, when she arrived in Bombay to attend the A.I.C.C. session, and demanded that they should be accorded the status of a minority, alleging *inter alia* that Muslims enjoyed that status.<sup>2</sup>

Minority as a category in political science and as a concept in international relations and law may be said to have cropped up almost full-fledged at the termination of World War I.<sup>3</sup> At the outset, I must emphasize the

fact that nobody has cared to define what is a minority in the earlier literature on the subject; second, that minorities which began to be noticed and mentioned as national, or other kind of groups, figured in the standard *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* only as national minorities; third, J. T. Zadrozny, in the *Dictionary of Social Sciences* (1960), notes three meanings of the term: (1) numerically minor group in any society; (2) a group racially or culturally different from the major racial or cultural group; (3) a group of people "who collectively have a subordinate or 'minor' status in terms of their legal and political rights, or their economic and social privileges".

Hans Kohn in his note on the subject in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1959) towards its end abruptly branches off into a paragraph to speak of the ex-untouchable classes, numbering according to him 60 million, as a minority, whose problem is "difficult" in contradistinction to that of Muslims. The problem of Muslims according to him is settled in India except in the State of Kashmir! Zadrozny evidently accommodates this extension of Kohn when he gives the third meaning of the term minority as those "who collectively have a subordinate or 'minor' status in terms of their legal and political rights, or their economic and social privileges". Hans Kohn's gymnastics over Muslims of India and of Kashmir have proved to be mere antics. For in his note on minorities in the 1964 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* he has discreetly omitted all mention about Muslims and has retained only his scientifically speaking dubious observations on untouchables as "one of the most vexing minority problems".

Hans Kohn's procedure in according the problem of untouchables in republican India—which, he, almost tardily, admits as having been legally alleviated, though mentioning the performance in the same breath as and in succession to the meagre, half-hearted and dubiously-intended effort of the British Indian Government—is inconsistent even with his own definition of the term minority, which he very explicitly states in the same note a little earlier. According to Kohn "minorities are groups held together by ties of common descent, language or religious faith and feeling themselves different in these respects from the majority of the inhabitants of a given political entity". It is a patent fact of social history, which even a novice or a callow student of Indian culture will testify to, that the "untouchables" had consistently refused to consider themselves as different from the majority Hindu communities and have pressed for the right to worship the same deities and follow the same ritual as that of the majority Hindu community. In terms of Hans Kohn's definition of a 'minority', "untouchable" therefore, cannot be considered to be a minority. Their problem or problems belong to a category different from that of "minority problems".

The truth of the matter appears to be that Hans Kohn has very little

respect for cogency. For, a little later in his note he tries to extricate himself from the difficulty created for him in respect of some highly evolved European people by his definition of a minority. He realized that in the technical sense of "minority" as "a group that does not feel at home" in the State where it lives "neither the Scots nor Welsh in Great Britain, nor the Bretons nor Basques in France nor the Italians in Switzerland can be regarded as minorities". So, of course, the definition must be liberalized or rather loosened to that extent. Kohn, an American intellectual, conveniently forgets in this context the problem of the Negroes in America, which a well-known and well worn-out fiction, promulgated by Israel Zangwill more than half a century ago, asserted to be a homogeneous solid block!

Dr Kohn, however, is reminded of the American problems centring round "Negroes, Asians and American Indians", to which list Puerto Ricans must also be added, "as the non-white minorities". He characterizes them as "the most difficult minority problems" of the United States "presented by the factual and sometimes even legal position" of these people. The context makes it probable that he is reminded of the Negroes and other minorities of the United States by his observations on the "untouchables" of India. If he had considered all these cases together before stating his definition of a minority he would have given us a more satisfactory definition of the category.

Louis Wirth,<sup>4</sup> then Professor of Sociology at Chicago University, had given us, 20 years before Kohn's rather disjointed note on minorities, a workable definition of the term, which Kohn in his specialized zeal, had evidently not noticed. Wirth defines a minority as

a group of people who, because of their physical or cultural characteristics, are singled out from the others in the society in which they live for differential or unequal treatment, and who therefore regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination . . . Minority status carries with it the exclusion from full participation in the life of the society.

Within a decade of, or rather only five years after, Wirth's pronouncement, MacIver and Page declared that probably about 50 million persons, i.e., more than a quarter of the total Americans, suffered minority group status in the American society, a declaration, which is in flat contradiction to what Dr Kohn chose to write only four or five years later in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. They stated their view of what a minority is only in words of Wirth just quoted.<sup>5</sup>

P. De Azcarate, in his note in the 14th Edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, has given a succinct but a balanced account of the recognition

<sup>4</sup> Ralph Linton, *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*. 1945, p. 347

<sup>5</sup> *Society, an Introductory Analysis*. 1957, pp. 387-89.

of national minorities and their rights (henceforth known as minority rights) laid down in the peace treaties by the Allies of World War I and also of the implementation of the same through the League of Nations. The latter organization came into the picture to such an extent that minority rights may be said, in the eyes of the world at large, to have been guaranteed by the League of Nations through a special committee of its own. In actual practice, when in 1934 the Polish Government announced its intention of disregarding all League communications in the matter, the rights of minorities in Poland, whatever they were, came to be wholly at the mercy of the Polish Government.

The special protection offered in the peace treaties and guaranteed by the League of Nations to minorities was for the "interests of inhabitants differing from the majority of the population of the States in race, language or religion", i.e., the League of Nations recognized only racial, linguistic or religious minorities. There is nowhere a mention of any national or cultural minority.<sup>6</sup>

The principal rights of racial, linguistic or religious minorities were: (1) Nationality—a person habitually resident in a particular territory or born of parents habitually resident there acquires the nationality of the nation-state to which that territory is made over in the treaty, with certain provisions for opting out. The option of renouncing the State was to be exercised within two years of the coming into force of the peace-treaty with the State. The opters could take away all of their movable property without any taxes, or duties, without let or hindrance, but had to leave all the immovable property in the State they were leaving. (2) Life, personal liberty and freedom of worship entitling all inhabitants to the "free exercise, whether public or private, of any creed, religion or belief whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or public morals". (3) Equal treatment before law for all inhabitants guaranteeing that "differences of race, language or religion shall not prejudice any national of the country in the matter of admission to public employments, functions and honours or the exercise of professions and industries". (4) Nationals belonging to minorities shall have "*an equal right to establish, manage and control at their own expense charitable, religious and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments*", and to use their own language therein. (5) The State shall not impose any restriction on the free use of their language by any minority for any purpose, private or public; (6) The State shall grant "nationals speaking a language other than the official language adequate facilities for the use of their language, either orally or in writing before the courts". (7) The State shall provide "adequate facilities in towns and districts where there is a considerable proportion of nationals speaking a language other than the official language of the State, to ensure that *in the primary schools the instruction shall be given to the children of such*

<sup>6</sup> E.B., 14th ed., pp. 568, 569, 571; *Nationalism*, p. 293; *Minorities*, p. 10.

*nationals through the medium of their own language*". (8) The State shall guarantee "in towns and districts with a considerable proportion of *nationals* belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities" that they are "assured an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of the sums which may be provided out of public funds under the State, municipal or other budget, for educational, religious or charitable purposes". (9) In the case of Muslim's in Albania and Greece the State shall take measures "to enable question of family law and personal status to be regulated in accordance with Muslim usage".

Upper Silesia, about 7 lakhs of whose inhabitants voted to be incorporated in Germany while the remaining less than 5 lakhs voted to be with Poland, had to be provided with special set of minority rights, much more elaborately planned, and an international arbitral and supervisory organization.<sup>7</sup> Some of the special provisions now in operation in India for the protection of linguistic minorities take very much after them. But as the whole set of Silesian provisions was cast in a purely political mould and put under a special agency I have thought it best not to encumber our narrative with them.

The Treaties which contained these provisions, did not lay down any duties for the minorities protected by them towards the host-State in which they were to enjoy the protection. And the right or stipulation numbered eighth in the above enumeration, which is a sort of an obligation on the host-State, most likely to be looked upon as repugnant in the absence of any obligations specifically enjoined on the minorities, appears to have remained almost a dead letter. For Azcarate, who was the Director of the Minorities' Questions Section of the League of Nations, writing on the questions in 1945, informed the world that the clause was "drawn up in language so confused and sibylline that we were never able to discover its real meaning, nor the value of its practical application".

The group-existence of minorities with group-rights which could be pressed by the minority as a group, keeping itself a compact unit with national consciousness and cultural distinctiveness and separation was not unequivocally or even fairly ambiguously guaranteed. Though the language of the minority was safeguarded for use by it in private and public affairs of all kinds the guaranteed State instruction through it was or could be confined rigidly to the primary stage. And I am not sure that a minority could on its own finance and organize instruction through its language at the higher stages of education. On the other hand, the host-State could have its official language, which, of course, would be that of the dominant national group, and could enjoin its compulsory teaching even at the primary stage of education.<sup>8</sup>

The groups, for which protection of the varied types detailed above was

<sup>7</sup> Azcarate, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-7, 136-60; Janowsky, pp. 160-1.

<sup>8</sup> *National Minorities*, p. 60.



secured mostly in the solemn treaties and placed under the international-guarantee-system of the League of Nations, were ethnic units with long traditions of national or semi-national existence, and strong politico-national consciousness. They are almost invariably described in most of the literature on the subject and in the treaties, as national minorities and not simply as either linguistic or religious minorities. Some of the writers on the subject and some documents of the League of Nations use for them the expression "national, linguistic and religious minorities".<sup>9</sup> But hardly any document speaks of them as cultural minorities, though among the rights secured by the international pacts figure that of the preservation of the culture of the minorities.

The report entitled Nationalism<sup>10</sup> issued by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in 1939, specifying the sources of "lack of unity in" and "of resistance to" a national state mentions "national minorities" within a State as one. And a "national minority", according to the same report, presenting "a serious bar to unity" is "any considerable number of inhabitants of a State dominated by one nation" which belongs "both by feeling and by objective marks such as language to a different nation", and is alternatively described as a "minority nation".

The evolution and history of these national minorities, all of them belonging to Central and Eastern Europe, are fairly detailed both in the above-mentioned work and in Azcarate's book *National Minorities*, one whole chapter of which is styled "National Minorities of Europe". C. A. Macartney, writing in 1934, had named his book *National States and National Minorities*. Janowsky's book (1945) is named *Nationalities and National Minorities* and discusses the treatment that should be given to these European minorities at the peace treaty or treaties which would "soon" have to be concluded. Inis Claude, writing a whole decade after Janowsky, and almost the same interval after their fate was sealed, styles his book, too, *National Minorities*, with the explanatory subtitle "An International Problem" as it had been one since the peace-treaties of the First World War.

The *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*<sup>11</sup> incorporated a note on "minorities" but as already mentioned, qualified the term with the adjective "National" following it. Max Hildebert Boehm, the contributor, wrote: "The term national minority is applied to a *distinct ethnic group with an individual national and cultural character* living within a state which is dominated by another nationality and which is viewed by the latter as the particular expression of its own individuality". According to Azcarate "what in the last resort constitutes the distinctive and characteristic features of a national minority is the *existence of a national consciousness*,

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 82-3; Janowsky, pp. 112-14, 131; Claude, pp. 19-20, 34.

<sup>10</sup> Pp. 277-94.

<sup>11</sup> Published in 1933, 12th printing, 1957. Italics mine.

*accompanied by linguistic and cultural differences*".<sup>12</sup>

The nature of these national minorities was so special and the national or state problems created by their existence and persistence in Central and Eastern Europe were so insistent and grave, that they had called forth a dynamic approach from two Austrian Socialists of the Hapsburg Empire of Austria-Hungary, Otto Bauer and Karl Renner, sometime before 1905, when they were, partially at least, put into operation in Moravia.<sup>13</sup> The adjustment or solution suggested by these thinkers, it appears to me, has been, along with the Swiss experiment, the inspiration for latter-day proposals, though no overt mention of the debt is found in these schemes or their framers' names. Whether a proposal for a resolution of the problems of national minorities within a national State is designated "Cultural Pluralism" or "Plural Society" as, adapting the Dutch colonial usage, the British Indian civilian J. S. Furnivall<sup>14</sup> did, in 1939 and 1948, or as "Cultural Pluralism" by E. George Payne in 1939 and by Prof. Louis Wirth in 1945, or again as "Social and Cultural Pluralism" by M. G. Smith<sup>15</sup> in 1960, it harkens back to Furnivall in the first instance only. In reality the parentage of the notion of "cultural pluralism" is traceable to the United States<sup>16</sup> whose Jewish citizen H. M. Kallen played with the idea in a series of articles published in 1915.

President Masaryk's<sup>17</sup> idea of new Europe put forth in 1918 which envisaged inter alia of "multinational States" perhaps for the first time—later modified into "Cultural Federalism" by Janowsky and into "National Federalism" by Professor James T. Shotwell and adopted by Janowsky in preference to other nomenclature, no doubt stems both from Bauer and Renner's plan and the Swiss experiment. In his appreciatively detailed description of the national federalism of the U.S.S.R., Janowsky<sup>18</sup> goes a step further and uses the expression "multi-National Federal State" for the Soviet Union, though Stalin and other Soviet leaders used the expression "multi-national socialist state".

The literature on "minority problems" and their treatment under the League of Nations, on the actual behaviour of minorities in the inter-war period and their proposed treatment by interested or disinterested intel-

<sup>12</sup> Pp. 4, 24.

<sup>13</sup> *Nationalism*, pp. 290-1; Claude, *op. cit.*, p. 89; Rupert Emerson, *From Empire to Nation*, p. 11, 55 and fn. 20, 587; Carl J. Friedrich, *Man and his Government*, 1963, pp. 354.

<sup>14</sup> *Netherlands India*, 1939, pp. 141, 212-14, 284-89, 365-66, 446-54; *Colonial Policy and Practice*, 1948, pp. 303-12, 539-40.

<sup>15</sup> Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek, *Our Racial and National Minorities*, Chapter XXVII; Ralph Linton, *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, p. 355; *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 83, pp. 763-75.

<sup>16</sup> Nathan Glazer in *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, 1954, Morroe Berger and others, p. 158.

<sup>17</sup> *The New Europe*, 1918, p. 21.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 96-7, XV, 43, 69, 96-7, 107, 145-47.

lectuals immediately after the Second World War, however, did not affect the content of the concept of the term "minority" to an appreciable degree. The Secretary General of the UN, Trygve Lie, in his *Memorandum on Minorities* presented in 1950, had this to say about it:

It follows from the analysis of the community, the nation and the State that the term 'minority' cannot for practical purposes be defined simply by interpreting the word in its literal sense. If this were the case, nearly all the communities existing within a State would be styled minorities, including families, social classes, cultural groups, speakers of dialects, etc. Such a definition would be useless . . . . As a matter of fact, the term 'minority' is frequently used at present in a more restricted sense; it has come to refer mainly to a particular kind of community, which differs from the predominant group in the State . . . . it is safe to say that, at least within the field of political science, this term is most frequently used to apply to communities with certain characteristics (ethnic, linguistic, cultural or religious groups, etc.) and almost always to communities of a national type. . . . \* Some minorities wish to obtain autonomy, while others only wish to keep alive the particular characteristics (language, culture, etc.) which distinguish them from the dominant group.<sup>19</sup>

Even though the minorities sought to be protected by the League of Nations through internationally guaranteed rights briefly listed above were "national minorities", which as Sir B. Namier<sup>20</sup> pointed out very pertinently "had, at sometime, formed States of their own", the ideas that leading statesmen of the League had in mind were in effect to bring about unification through some kind of smoothly operating process of assimilation. Thus, though it was in 1925, i.e., four or five years after the first treaty guaranteeing minority rights was signed, M. de Mello Franco of Brazil, "one of the most important authorities on minorities questions among the members of the League Council" said:

It seems to me obvious that those who conceived this system of protection did not dream of creating within States a group of inhabitants who regard themselves as permanently foreign to the general organisation of the country. On the contrary, they wished the elements of the population contained in such a group to enjoy a status of legal protection which might ensure respect for the inviolability of the person under all its aspects and which might gradually prepare the way for conditions

\* Italics mine.

<sup>19</sup> Loc. cit., pp. 8-9.

<sup>20</sup> *Conflicts*, 1945, pp. 2-3. Cf. Louis Wirth in Ralph Linton's *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, p. 356.

*necessary for the establishment of a complete national unity.\**

Sir Austin Chamberlain supported this view in the following even more explicit words: "*It was certainly not the intention of those who had devised this system . . . to establish in the midst of nation a community which would remain permanently estranged from the national life.*"<sup>21</sup>

If such was not the intention of the first framers of the rights scheme, it certainly was so interpreted by those whose privilege it was to interpret the law and apply it soon after the framing of the treaties. The Third Ordinary Assembly of the League in 1922, defining certain points of the procedure to be adopted in settling minorities questions, passed the following two resolutions laying down the duties of the minorities. In thus acting the Assembly took the healthiest way to political and social haven. For rights without corresponding duties are corrosive of social and political life. If the minorities are guaranteed certain rights correlate duties must also be laid upon them. The resolutions ran:

1. While the Assembly recognizes the primary right of minorities to be protected by the League from oppression, it also *emphasizes the duty incumbent upon persons belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities to cooperate as loyal fellow-citizens with the nations to which they now belong.*
2. The Secretariat of the League, which has the duty of collecting information concerning the manner in which the minorities treaties are carried out, should not only assist the Council in the study of complaints concerning infractions of these treaties, but *should also assist the Council in ascertaining in what manner the persons belonging to racial, linguistic or religious minorities fulfil their duties towards their States.*<sup>22</sup>

The reluctance, nay the refusal, to treat these minorities, though they were unequivocally and boldly spoken of and written about as national minorities, on a group basis is another and even clearer indication that the majority of the statesmen of the world, engaged in rearing an international organization for the peace and guidance of humanity, looked upon the whole system of guarantees of minority rights as only a stage in the process of engrafting and integrating the national minorities into the body politic of the host-state, making the latter a solid and peaceful whole. Western statesmen, therefore, resolved that the guaranteed rights pertained to "*individuals* as members of minorities rather than to minorities as groups", and avoided recognizing minorities as "legal entities or public corporations"

\* Italics mine.

<sup>21</sup> Janowsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-30. Italics mine.

<sup>22</sup> E.B. (14th ed.), Vol. 15, p. 571 (a); Azcarate, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-9, 132-4, Italics mine.

with a group-status. The assumption, as Janowsky, who is naturally a bitter critic of this circumstance and of the attitude of Western statesmen, points out, was the existence of national rather than multi-national states. Inis Claude puts it even better when he observes. . . .<sup>23</sup>

*. . . . the drafters [of the Treaties] deliberately avoided terminology from which it might have been inferred that minorities as corporate units were the intended beneficiaries of the system. It was generally held that to recognize minorities per se would have been inconsistent with the concept of sovereignty.*

That the drafters of the treaties in nineteen nineteen and nineteen twenties were mostly engaged on demarcating national States in Europe is the consensus of experts qualified to pronounce an authoritative opinion on the subject, however short of the ideal their actual achievement might have fallen. As Claude<sup>24</sup> observes: "The principle of 'one nation one State', was not realized to the full extent permitted by the ethnographic configuration of Europe, but *it was approximated more closely than ever before*".

Was the expectation or rather the desire of these European statesmen, or the wishes of the other statesmen, who only worked for the easing of the tensions and for paving the way not for assimilation but peaceful and negotiational approach to and solution of all problems, fulfilled? Were the minorities content to secure and enjoy their rights within their host-states without fomenting any trouble for them? What was the experience of the statesmen who supplanted the older ones like Franco of Brazil and Chamberlain of Great Britain? Inis Claude<sup>25</sup> tells his readers that "President Benes and other members of his government in exile were thoroughly disillusioned and utterly determined that *their country should never again take the risks involved in the policy of conceding a special status to national minorities.*" Benes is quoted as having stated his position as follows:

*"The protection of minorities in the future should consist primarily in the defence of human democratic rights and not of national rights. Minorities in individual states must never again be given the character of internationally recognized political and legal units, with the possibility of again becoming sources of disturbance."*

Janowsky<sup>26</sup> who was all out for "Cultural Federalism", or "National Federalism", as he preferred to speak of it, at the end of the Second World

<sup>23</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 19-20, 34; Azcarate, pp. 9-13.

<sup>24</sup> Pp. 12-5. Italics mine.

<sup>25</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 56-74. Italics mine.

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 136-38.

War, is at pains either to explain away or to besmear the views of the great statesmen so that they should not block the way for his pet scheme. In his anxious hurry to press forward his favourite scheme of "National Federalism" to tackle the problem of "national minorities" of East Central Europe, Janowsky forgets to take note of the American reaction to the inter-war behaviour of these European minorities. One, therefore, fails to find even an echo of the powerful voice of the American Under-Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, which made the following<sup>27</sup> resounding statement on the problem in May 1943.

Finally, in the kind of world for which we fight, there must cease to exist any need for the use of *that accursed term 'racial or religious minority.'* If the people of the earth are fighting and dying to preserve and to secure the liberty of the individual under law, *is it conceivable that the peoples of the United Nations can consent to the establishment of any system where human beings will still be regarded as belonging to such 'minorities'?*

Claude makes his own enlightening contribution to the revelation of the American view in the remark:<sup>28</sup> "The leading tendency of Pan-American thought was decidedly Wellesian" and he adds valuable information about the wider attitude more or less of the same type. He says: "The hard fact was that statesmen, generally backed by a public opinion which was deeply impressed by the perfidy of irredentist and disloyal minorities, were disposed to curtail, rather than to expand, the rights of minorities."<sup>29</sup> J. A. Laponce, writing five years after Claude, summarizes the situation as even more decidedly against special protection. He says:<sup>30</sup>

As compared with the preceding period, the period after World War II marked a setback in the protection of minorities by treaty . . . . The lack of treaty protection for minorities seems to be due to a change in the attitude of the great powers toward minorities. *Although the assumption underlying the Versailles treaties was that the protection of minorities would be a guarantee of peace, that underlying the post-World War II treaties was that the elimination of minorities by absorption into the national community would suppress one cause of conflict.*

The unofficial thought on the subject of minorities, whether "national" or "racial" or both together, represented by Janowsky's pet scheme of "national federalism", or "cultural pluralism" of some earlier writers but dis-

<sup>27</sup> Quoted by Claude at p. 74 of his book *National Minorities*. Italics mine.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 75.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Claude, pp. 69, 70-3.

<sup>30</sup> *The Protection of Minorities*, 1960, p. 33. Italics mine.

carded for tactical reasons, I think, by Janowsky, or "cultural autonomy"<sup>31</sup> of other later writers, must now engage our attention. As stated earlier, all that kind of thought owes its ultimate origin as far as I can see to the plan put up by Bauer and Renner and to some extent put into operation in Moravia in 1905, where, according to the study-group of the Royal Institute of International Affairs,<sup>32</sup> it "worked fairly well". According to Bauer and Renner's plan "the cultural and educational functions of government were to be separated from those which were purely administrative and technical; the latter were to be decentralized upon a territorial basis, while control over the former was to be left to the separate national groups, the members of which were to elect special bodies to administer these matters. The national councils were to be free to raise what taxes they liked from their own members in order to meet the cost of their cultural activities. Thus, two kinds of government were to be set up for the same area; alongside the normal territorial organization were to be other national organizations. Each nation was to have its own institutions, and look after its members in all matters affected by national considerations." Rather strange as it may seem, Janowsky does not refer to this plan nor to its architects! And Claude (pp. 88-89), who should have done better as he mentions Bauer and Renner and points them out as having "developed it shortly before the First World War", gives the palm to Janowsky who proposed a similar plan with a few things nonchalantly added from the disastrous experience of the special scheme implemented or rather attempted to be implemented by the League of Nations till about 1934, and then speaks of "the Bauer-Renner plan" as "a variant of the usual type of cultural pluralist doctrine". Laponce traces the origin of Bauer-Renner plan to the writings of Kossuth in 1851.

The British authors of the above-mentioned work as well as the later American writers referred to in this book as having taken a fairly detailed and contextual view of the Bauer-Renner plan, have pointed out more or less identical defects of the same which stamp it as capable of more evil than good, and rendered and renders it unworthy of application. The evaluation of the plan made by the authors of "*Nationalism*" is both the earlier and the more comprehensive of all the estimates and brings out an aspect of the ultimate goal of the plan to have been that of smoothening the process of assimilation of the minorities or of the groups, which were to be thus treated, in their national communities. They observe:

It is true that the most acute conflicts in the Hasburg Empire raged over such questions as the use of languages, schools, theatres, etc. which were clearly connected with national culture. But *the very form of the*

<sup>31</sup> Janowsky, p. 148; Claude, p. 88.

<sup>32</sup> *Nationalism*, pp. 290-91; Claude, pp. 88-9; Laponce, pp. 86-90; Rupert Emerson, *From Empire to Nation*, pp. 111, 183.

*central government may be a matter upon which the different nations hold different views, as may foreign policy; social and commercial legislation will be of national interest where it affects the members of one nation beneficially and those of another adversely.* Moreover, even if the separation could be made, the scheme could be permanently successful only if the national and the non-national compartments of the government never came into contact, and if the decisions of one national group never affected the members of another. *By removing some vexed questions from the sphere of controversy, the scheme offers a prospect of reducing national antagonisms and thus of creating an atmosphere in which assimilation will become easier.\**

The last point in the observations quoted above is open to serious questioning both as to its ever having been even the remotest of the objectives of the framers of the plan and also to its ever lending itself to such a denouement. Laponce<sup>33</sup> assures us that

Bauer maintained the notion of minority. Renner's solution was more subtle in that it seemed to put minority and dominant group on equal terms . . . . They did not fully integrate the minorities into the state's structure. Their constant and whole endeavour was to separate national questions from the rest. *This would have been sound if the Austrian minorities had been of a religious or even purely linguistic type, but they were national minorities as well, and as such would not have been satisfied with being placed on legislative and administrative "reservations".*

"Cultural pluralism" as a charming and useful notion was likely to make a strong appeal, wherever there was tension and strife to all peace-loving intellectuals and practical statesmen. By a very easy way, so common in society where short-cuts and slogans have a vogue, illustrations of cultural pluralism could be presented in the intensely happy national community of Switzerland,\* and in the fairly happy communities of Belgium, Canada, and Great Britain. The slow long processes of wars, and the socially common endeavour of over almost a millenium in the last case could be conveniently slurred over in the usual tendency of economy of effort. The American situation, particularly with the native Indians, the semi-native Negroes and the immigrant Chinese, Italians, Japanese, Poles and other Slavs, each group keeping a kind of separate private or semi-private national life of its own, and presenting for all practical purposes a unified

\* Italics mine.

<sup>33</sup> *The Protection of Minorities*, p. 89. Italics mine.

\* Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations* (1963) has however characterized Switzerland's example as a false one.



American national front, invited America's intellectuals to engraft the notion of "cultural pluralism" on their society without the employment of the rather hated qualification of "multi-national".

It is noteworthy that almost the first systematic<sup>34</sup> treatment of the minorities in American life given in 1932 by Donald Young, in his book entitled *American Minority Peoples*, would appear to be devoid of any mention of cultural pluralism. In 1934 came the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt. And in 1936 was implemented in the U.S.S.R. its new Constitution which stated the doctrine of national federalism and put into practice the idea of cultural pluralism. The Constitution<sup>35</sup> lists sixteen autonomous republics in the U.S.S.R. Janowsky, who is an enthusiastic propagandist for national federalism or cultural pluralism, comments on the provisions:

In other words, the nationalities constituted regional, provincial or smaller territorial units and enjoyed a status and a political structure similar to other territorial subdivisions . . . . In administrative practice . . . they enjoyed autonomy in cultural and local affairs. In short, "federalism" in R.S.F.S.R. meant local government by the native population, and linguistic and cultural autonomy.

Brown and Roucek, presenting a fresh study of American minorities in 1939, reflected the influence of the new climate of opinion in the title of their book *Our Racial and National Minorities* and more so in the incorporation of a whole chapter by E. George Payne<sup>36</sup> entitled "Education and Cultural Pluralism". And the author takes care to inform his readers that "the theory of cultural pluralism" is "a new theory of the adjustment of minority groups to major civilizations" that "has been emerging in recent years". Payne comments on the theory thus:

If the cultural pluralism theory is correct, then the problem of adjustment becomes essentially, that of preserving cultural traits, of *dignifying qualities and practices different from our own*; and of creating a feeling of pride in the folkways, mores, customs, conventions, and social patterns, characteristic of the immigrant in his homeland as well as of the Negro and the Indian. *Education, therefore, under this theory assumes a totally different role.*

The fascination of the charming doctrine can be gauged from the fact that Payne, though he advises his readers and his American compatriots not to worry about "the ultimate preservation of different cultural streams"

<sup>34</sup> Charles F. Marden, *Minorities in American Society*, 1952, p. 27; Wagley and Harris, *Minorities in the New World*, 1958, p. 293.

<sup>35</sup> Amos J. Peaslee, *Constitutions of Nations*, Vol. III (2nd ed.), p. 486.

<sup>36</sup> Brown and Roucek, p. 762. Italics mine.

in their civilization, does so evidently because somehow he has been able to persuade himself that only "the best of the various cultures" will be preserved and that the "degree of acculturation inevitable" in the process will be so high that "a new and superior culture will emerge". He rounds up his hopeful exhortation and his rosy vision with the statement: "Cultural pluralism then does not imply that the special cultures will continue unchanged in the general stream for all time."<sup>37</sup> The last assertion which is more a wish-fulfilment than a reasoned proposition is directly countered by the opinion of the first author of the book in which Payne's contribution forms one chapter. Francis J. Brown<sup>38</sup> observes on the aims of the protagonists of the theory of cultural pluralism:

On the one hand are those who believe that the solution [regarding the American community of the future] can be found only through the complete assimilation of all minority groups and the eventual blending of all nations and races into a *composite pattern which will be American*. On the other hand are those who with equal insistence believe that the greatest catastrophe which could come to American life would be the discarding of this rich and varied cultural heritage - *rich because so varied*. *The former emphasize the centrifugal forces and seek to strengthen them still further; the latter do all within their power to maintain the agencies of cultural differentiation.*

Louis Wirth, then Professor of Sociology at Chicago and a well-known author of contributions, one of the intellectual team commissioned under the New Deal administration to prepare background material helpful to large-scale planning, writing in 1945 observed:<sup>39</sup> "that recently the United States in the policy towards her ethnic as distinguished from her racial minorities [Negroes, Indians, Puerto Ricans, Chinese and Japanese] was regarded as the great experimental proving ground where minority problems either did not become acute or were being solved satisfactorily. Millions of our immigrants wanted to become Americans. Consequently we assumed that ours was the pattern after which other peoples would, if they could, model themselves . . . in recent years, however, world attention has been shifting to Russia's attempt to deal with her minorities. The Russian experiment is regarded by many as not only at least as enlightened as our own, but as much more relevant to the minority problems of Europe and the backward regions of the world."

Charles F. Marden, writing<sup>40</sup> in 1952, has to record the advancing march of the acculturative assimilative process, at least as far as the religious mino-

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 763.

<sup>38</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 571. Italics mine.

<sup>39</sup> Ralph Linton, *The Science of Man in World Crisis*, 1945, pp. 369-70.

<sup>40</sup> *Minorities in American Society*, pp. 393-94. Italics mine.

rities, mostly "white", among the minorities of European origin are concerned, approximating their culture to the American pattern and not to a new pattern, whether of high or lower grade. He says,

*The changing aspects of social differentiation in the United States have vastly altered the picture in relation to cultural pluralism. The acculturative process in due time will eliminate nationality cultural difference. Dominant Americans no longer need be taught to be tolerant to cultural differences of German or Swedish descended people in their society because the latter are no longer Germans or Swedes . . . the realistic fact of the matter is that Americans of Italian, Polish or Hungarian descent are not going to be Italians, Poles or Hungarians culturally, much longer, regardless of the reactions of dominant status people. The residual group differences will be racial and religious.*

And what deliberative and evaluative comments Marden has on the recent theory of dominant minority relations and on their implementation in American society raise the presumption that the charming-looking theory of cultural pluralism may not unjustifiably be looked upon as a cloak for Negro and other non-"white" segregation! Marden<sup>41</sup> remarks on the educational theory and practice in recent and contemporary U.S.A.:

*The trend in recent years in educational theory has been toward the cultural pluralism viewpoint, interestingly enough at a time when the Americans of European lineage have already become so acculturated that their interest in and attachment to their old world heritage is quite minimal.*

Another source of the so-called cultural pluralism of the American intellectuals as far as the Negroes and Indians are concerned may be stated in the words of Louis Wirth who observes:<sup>42</sup> "If there is a great gulf between their [that of the dominant group] own status and that of the minority group, if there is a wide difference between the two groups in race or origin, the toleration of minorities may go as far as virtually to *perpetuate several subsocieties within the larger society.*"

Simson and Yinger in the third edition (1965) of their book entitled *Racial and Cultural Minorities*,<sup>43</sup> first published in 1953, after carefully specifying and describing the various approaches to the problem of minorities in America and discussing at length the notion of cultural pluralism as a suggested panacea for the problem of the Negroes, quite logically and enlighteningly raise the question, "Will a Separate Negro Culture Emerge?"

<sup>41</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 108-09. Italics mine.

<sup>42</sup> Ralph Linton, p. 355. Italics mine.

<sup>43</sup> Pp. 20-26; 176-78.

and answer it thus: "The tone of most Negro protest to-day is integrationist, not pluralistic." They quote the observations of the Negro writer, Louis Lomax, made in his book published in 1963, and opine that the movement for the building up of a Negro culture in America is "unlikely in the foreseeable future to be anything more than tiny, compared with the drive for desegregation". They have taken special care to expound their convictions in a more detailed manner in a footnote, the relevant portion—almost the whole being so—of which runs:

We tend to be integrationist; but we also believe that a dash of Negro pluralism in this large and complex society may be desirable. From our point of view, if this perspective is maintained by only a few, or becomes only a small part of the perspective of all, it may well add flexibility and enrichment to American society and help to maintain pride among Negroes. As a strong movement, however, promoted by a slow pace in the elimination of injustice, it could contribute to a vicious circle by strengthening tendencies toward prejudice and schism rather than a mutually respecting pluralism.

The fact is that since the later twenties of the twentieth century the Negroes in America have produced leaders who have assumed militant attitude towards the question of desegregation. This attitude, however, can manifest itself in two ostensibly opposed movements, one being to organize Negro people on the world-scale in common with the onward marching Negro peoples of Africa and to proclaim to Americans and others that the Negroes have a culture of their own, the other being to storm the citadel of segregation by sheer force and violent action. The latter kind of movement may be said to have begun in right earnest with the appearance of what are known as the Black Muslims on the American scene. To baulk this movement the charming doctrine of pluralism may be put forward as both a shield and a spearhead. As a shield it is calculated to stave off immediate violence and as a spearhead it is to prepare the Negroes for what Wagley and Harris<sup>4</sup> are convinced shall be their fate in the States, viz., to have "at best a more satisfactory pluralistic adjustment within the larger society", as the attitudes and customs of the white people are designed to keep the Negro a Negro.

At this stage it is desirable and necessary to briefly mention the appraisal of the views of American intellectuals and more so of the social agencies working in the cause of inter-group relations in the United States made by Professor Robin M. Williams in 1945-47 in his book *The Reduction of Inter-Group Tensions*. For, the same author, after a research project carried out over a decade with the assistance and collaboration of a number of researchers, published his well-considered views on the subject of Negro-

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 291.

White relationship in the States in 1964 in the book entitled *Strangers Next Door*\* (pp. 309-86).

Williams tells us that the two extremes in the outlook and programmes then current in regard to "different ethnic or more rarely, racial and religious groups" were:

- (1) "Complete acculturation, to one relatively homogeneous set of beliefs and behaviour patterns", the emphasis being on "Americanization" or "assimilation"; and
- (2) fostering "a mosaic type of society in which many separate groups retain their traditional cultural characteristics and in which there is a minimum of contact among different groups; for the integration of the whole society "reliance" being "placed on philosophies of tolerance, supported by common and interlocking economic and political interests, or on various kinds of suppression and authoritative controls".

Williams informs us further that as far as "cultural groups" [?] are concerned "there was a third and an intermediate point of view" which, according to him, was known as "cultural pluralism" or "cultural democracy". The end-result, so Williams informs us, envisioned in this "intermediate" outlook is that "a considerable portion of the cultural distinctiveness of various groups will be retained" and with an "extensive interaction among" them, "at least a *minimal body of shared values and traditions will be emphasized*". (p. 11. *Italics mine*).

It will be realized that the cultural pluralism advocated by Janowsky and others for the Central and Eastern European national minorities or the one advocated by some American intellectuals for the Negroes in the United States, and mentioned earlier, is the second viewpoint and not the intermediate one of Williams' categorization!

Writing in 1964, a decade after Milton M. Gordon<sup>45</sup> had not only accommodated both types of "pluralism" in his scheme of types of attitudes and procedures towards minority problems in the United States, but had added a composite fifth type, combining "pluralism" with "integration" as distinct from assimilation, Williams speaks of "pluralism" of only one description characterizing it as the one advocated by the great Negro leader Booker T. Washington! This does not mean, however, that he has entirely forgotten his "mosaic pattern" of pluralism. He brings it in, without calling the attitude and pattern "pluralism", in his summing up of the situation of

\* It may interest readers to learn that 43 years before Professor Williams, Park and Burgess in their book *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (p. 773) referred to the European immigrants and settlers as "the strangers within our gates".

<sup>45</sup> Morroe Berger and others, *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, 1954, p. 149,

the Negro minority in the United States. Says Williams: "Thus, the pluralism of American society continues to be a changing and conflictful condition . . . . It cannot settle for a caste system, nor for a mosaic society of separate cultural segments."

Hans Kohn,<sup>46</sup> too, wrote, in the same year as Williams did: "The most difficult minority problems of the United States are presented by the factual and sometimes even legal position of the non-white minorities—Negroes, Asians and American Indians."

A brief statement, however compressed, of the Negro-agitation in U.S.A., will illuminate the remarks of Hans Kohn and Robert M. Williams. Elijah Muhammad, who has been designated the Messiah by C. Eric Lincoln,<sup>47</sup> "the son of a Southern Baptist minister", has been in control of the movement going under the name of the Black Muslims for the last thirty years or so. The Black Muslims believe themselves to be "the lost nation of Islam" and that "salvation will come from a discovery of that tradition. All science stems from the work of 24 original black scientists, thousands of years ago." They have established separate schools and built up separate businesses in America.<sup>48</sup>

Not even a whole year had elapsed since Williams made the above-quoted observation when we read of Negroes on the war-path in many great cities of America beginning with New York and Chicago, the slogan much to the forefront being that of "black power" and the activity being that of violence. The impact was so great that a daily paper from Indiana State, specifically from the small University town of Bloomington, where Negroes are almost conspicuous by their absence, the *Daily Herald Telephone*, in its issue of July 15, 1966, published a small write-up on it by the most well-known of America's columnists, the old guard, Walter Lippmann, who had convulsed the academic world of social scientists 45 years or so before with his books *Public Opinion* and *Preface to Morals*. Here it is, the whole of it:

The argument about "black power" is an argument about how the Negroes can restore the momentum of progress in obtaining better housing and better schools, which were the promises of 1965. The Negro militants, who speak to the deep poverty and wretchedness of the ghettos, are arguing that progress can be pushed along only by the use of Negro votes, boycotts and angry defiance. The Negro moderates stake their hopes on votes, persuasion and non-violent civil disobedience and de-

<sup>46</sup> E.B. (1964 ed), "Minorities", p. 575(a).

<sup>47</sup> *Journal of Social Issues*, 1963, pp 75-85. On Black Muslims also see James H. Lane in *Social Forces*, 1963-64, pp. 315-23.

<sup>48</sup> Simpson and Yinger, pp. 153, 319-20, 390-92; 534-44; Everett C. Hughes in *American Sociological Review*, 1963, p. 883.

monstration. The cruel fact of the matter is that neither tactics will work under present war [Vietnamese] conditions. The basic reality is that the 22 million Negroes, though a large number, are only about 10 per cent of the nation. Obviously they cannot coerce the huge majority, and they have no power of any kind which, if exercised recklessly, will not bring on severe reprisals and repressions.

The insistence on the concept of 'black-power' and the persistence of violent reaction were still on the increase, and we read a longish report made by John D Pomfret from Washington to *The New York Times*, appearing in its issue of July 21, 1966, quoting from the press conference of President Johnson his frank and firm pronouncement on the situation. Some of the weighty words of the President were quoted by the reporter. The President had said at his news conference of July 5:

1. That he "was not interested in black power or white power" but was concerned with "democratic power with a 'd'";
2. That he believed that "if we are not to lose a great many of the gains that we have made in recent years in treating people equally in this country and giving them equality in opportunity and equality in education, equality in employment, *then we must recognize that while there is a Negro minority of 10 per cent in this country there is a majority of 90 per cent that are not Negroes*",\* and that he believed that "most of those 90 per cent have come around to the viewpoint of wanting to see equality and justice given to their fellow citizens";
3. That the 90 per cent non-Negroes of the country wanted to see that equality and justice were given "under the law" and "done orderly" and "without violence"; and
4. That he hoped that "the lawfully constituted authorities of this country, as well as every citizen of this country, will obey the law; will not resort to violence, will do everything they can to cooperate with constituted authority to see that the evil conditions are remedied, that equality is given, and that progress is made."

Even with this stern warning by the President the violent behaviour and the slogan of 'black power' did not subside for some time. Without, however, following the events further I shall end this brief account of the Negro reaction to the total American situation, including the White American intellectuals' propaganda for the enticingly charming notion of "cultural pluralism" with a few observations on the Black Muslims and their leader Elijah Muhammad, from a special article from the pen of Robert Lipsyte appearing in *The New York Times* (24 July 1966). The most in-

\* Italics mine.

teresting and significant point that appears in Lipsyte's narration is that the great Negro boxer, Cassius Clay, is a Black Muslim and as such is named Muhammad Ali. Elijah Muhammad, with his brightly starred cap bearing the Muslim emblem of the starred crescent moon, equally bright, has great influence over Clay, giving the Black Muslims "growing control over the heavy-weight boxing championship", and securing the great asset of publicizing Elijah Muhammad's utterances. Two other Black Muslims, one a son of Elijah Muhammad and the other the sect's national secretary named John Ali—this compounding of Christian and Muslim names may be noted—were concerned in the promotion of boxing ventures. The Black Muslim treasury is "a major beneficiary of Ali's [Cassius Clay's] ring earnings". Elijah's objective, however, in Ali's accession to his sect is the prospective gain of youthful conversions to the Black Muslim sect!

I have given enough details about the theory of and proposal for "cultural pluralism" as applied by American intellectuals to the problems of American minorities to enable the reader to see for himself that it is not the same thing as Janowsky's elaboration of the old Bauer and Renner plan of "cultural autonomy" for the minorities of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, nor even similar to the professed federalism of the U.S.S.R., whether one speaks of them as "national federalism" with Janowsky or continues to call them "cultural pluralism" or even merely "cultural autonomy".

The cultural pluralism of the suggested American pattern is hardly anything more than tolerance of and connivance at differential culture, accompanied by absence of discrimination in politico-economic sphere as much as possible, with very little bearing on social segregation! And I should like to emphasize here the fact that even this diluted form of this enticingly-charming-looking scheme is pronounced by Wagley and Harris<sup>49</sup> to be harmful to social health of a community and rejected by them as a solution of the minority problem in the Americas.

Wagley and Harris describe in three large sections "six case studies" of minorities: two Indian minorities of South America, two Negro minorities, one in the U.S.A. and the other in Martinique in the Atlantic off Venezuela, and two European minorities, the French in Canada and the Jews in the U.S.A. It is noteworthy that the authors refer to only one of the six case-studies of theirs in the style most befitting national solidarity surpassing ethnic or minority solidarity, viz., the French Canadians. In the case of the other five groups their manner of reference stresses their ethnic solidarity, making their national affiliation quite secondary. They are Negroes or Jews or Indians inhabiting their particular part of the world and not Negro Americans or Jew Americans or Indian Brazilians, etc. Yet in the end, viewing the suggested solutions of minority problems the world-over, they pronounce an adverse opinion on the particular solution

<sup>49</sup> Wagley, and Harris, *op cit.* pp 286-88 *Italics mine*



of minority problems. They say:

*It must be said that pluralism will always be fraught with danger and that the probable consequence of pluralistic aims is perpetuation of some degree of conflict between minority and majority.*

About the cultural fate of the Indians of Mexico, who have been strenuously resisting the assimilative process for more than four hundred years, they say that with the assimilationist policy of the dominant group of Mexico being what it is in modern technological milieu their assimilation seems "inevitable". The similarly pluralistic minority of America, the Indians, have yet many enclaves intact and the authors have left the statement bare without venturing on a guess about the shape of future things! About Negroes who are an assimilationist minority in the U.S.A. they say that they "seem fated for at best a more satisfactory pluralistic adjustment within the larger society". What they assert is the permanence or near-permanence of the term Negro and its application to the progeny of a Negro parent or parents. They, however, round up their discussion with a strong testimonial in favour of assimilation thus: "Between the two alternatives [assimilation and pluralism], assimilation should in the long run provide a sounder basis for a truly democratic society, *for the presence of pluralistic minority groups in a society seems always to harbour the danger of conflict and of the subordination of one group by another.*"<sup>50</sup> This opinion Wagley himself repeated at a conference on "social and cultural pluralism in the Caribbean" held a little later and reported in the January 1960 issue of *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*.<sup>51</sup>

The notion quite often seen associated with "cultural pluralism" in its connotation of not merely "cultural autonomy" but even more so of "national federalism" is that of "plural society". So much so is this the case that Professor Rupert Emerson, in an otherwise solid contribution to the study of the political phenomenon of colonialism and its disruption, has used the expression "Plural Society" in the heading of one chapter (XVII) of his book, *From Empire to Nation*, which he must have completed writing almost at the same time the above-mentioned conference was in session. The fascination for this expression, the notion underlying it not having been fully definitized, nor having been properly grasped by its secondary users in some of the socio-political thought of the decade 1955 to 1965, has been disastrous in so far as it has clouded clear thinking on the problems of the minorities or even of democracy.\*

I shall devote a little space to dispose of that notion and its relevance

<sup>50</sup> Wagley and Harris, *op. cit.*, 289-94. Italics mine.

<sup>51</sup> Vol. 83, pp. 777-79.

\* George G. E. Catlin, for example, in his book *Political and Sociological Theory and its Applications* (1964, p. 79), uses the expression "plural society" to denote a modern society which R. M. MacIver has rightly called a "multi-group society".

to the problems under consideration.

As pointed out earlier J. S. Furnivall, though not the absolute originator of the expression or the notion, was the first author to use it in English in a context which facilitated its easy currency. The type of society he came across in Netherlands India or in Burma before 1940 was the society which he designated as plural society. Speaking of Netherlands India in 1938, Furnivall in one chapter of his book *Netherlands India* headed "Plural Economy", devoting three sections to "Plural Economy" under that caption, gave one section each to "Plural Societies" and "The Plural State" under these captions respectively, and rounded off his study with one section headed "Federalism". Furnivall, thus thought of plural economy, plural state and plural society, and noticing "the good" [!] achieved through such an economico-socio-political organization dubbed it "federalism", which one cannot help remarking was a travesty of the political concept going under that name in Political Science or in political practice like that of Switzerland!

Furnivall offered to the world his study of Netherlands India "as an example of a plural society" specifying or defining the latter concept as "a society comprising two or more elements or social orders which live side by side, yet without mingling, in one political unit". But in Netherlands India the rulers and the ruled were of "different race". I should add that not only were the ruled of a different race from that of the rulers but among themselves they belonged to two races at least, Chinamen, and Native Indians who cannot be described as pure Mongoloids. Furnivall counted among his species of plural society not only South Africa and Canada but also Ireland and Western Canada "where people of different racial origin tend to live in distinct settlements", and even the United States of America and proclaimed that Netherlands India was "merely an extreme type of a large class of political organizations".

In the description of the economy of a plural society Furnivall starts with that of "the plural state" and states the most obvious feature thus:

*... in a plural society there is no common will except, possibly, in matters of supreme importance, such as aggression from outside", adding that in its political aspect "a plural society resembles a confederation of political provinces, united by treaty or within the limits of a formal constitution, merely for certain ends common to the constituent units and, in matters outside the terms of union, each living its own life. But it differs from a confederation in that the constituent elements are segregated each within its own territorial limits." A plural society "has the instability of a confederation, but without the remedy which is open to a confederation if the yoke of common union should become intolerable".*

Furnivall's purpose having been to warn his countrymen against the rising tide of nationalism in India and against their ideas of democracy and their application to India even as in the Act of 1935, he emphasizes the weakness of plural society, India by implication being another specimen of the species, though not mentioned in the list made earlier by him. Thus he points out that "*within a plural society, the welfare of the several elements can be safeguarded only by a conflict of will in an argument where voting will carry very little weight except as an index to the force behind it*". And mentioning the reforms of 1917 as a recognition of Nationalism he observes: "but Nationalism within a plural society is itself a disruptive force, tending to shatter and not to consolidate the social order". To meet the situation he recommended the Dutch solution operating in Netherlands India. He further tells them and us that it approached most nearly "the theory of dual mandate" as some specimens of governing arrangement in tribal and Colonial Africa were known in English political and anthropological literature. There is no more reason for this arrangement being dubbed "federalism" than Furnivall's will to name it such. He only observes: "This solution in its acceptance of the plural character of such societies, may be termed the Federal solution".<sup>52</sup> Just as well, can one declare it to be a democratic solution and cry that after all colonialism is another, and shall we say better, form of democracy!

Furnivall, writing eight years after his thoughts summarized above were published, after the Japanese inroad into Burma was over and Burma had become independent, was agile enough to welcome the independence of that so-called plural society and to reverse his dictum about nationalism being a disruptive force and to proclaim that "*independence could transform nationalism from a destructive fever into a creative force*".<sup>53</sup> The intervening period with its tempo of quick change had sobered Furnivall to acknowledge the need for better discrimination about the width of his newly discovered political species. He admitted that "outside the tropics" at least society may have plural features, notably in South Africa,—the great discovery of a member of the new political species named "plural society" in the islands of the Atlantic off the north coast of south America, referred to as the Caribbean, had yet to wait a few years for its Furnivall in the person of M. G. Smith of the Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research<sup>54</sup>—Canada and the United States, and "also in lands where the Jew has not been fully assimilated into social life". In other countries also where there are mixed populations with "particularist tendencies . . . *There is a society with plural features, but not a plural society*".

In his analogical reasoning, too, Furnivall made an advance recognizing greater complexity in the so-called confederation of a plural society. He

<sup>52</sup> *Netherlands India*, pp. 446-49.

<sup>53</sup> *Colonial Policy and Practice*, 1948. Preface, pp. 305-07. Italics mine.

<sup>54</sup> *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. Vol. 83 (1959-60), pp. 761 ff.

observes :

*In a confederation each unit is segregated within its own territorial limits; there is contact between the states but not between their members as individuals; the union is voluntary; the terms of union are definite and limited; and any party can at will withdraw from the confederacy . . . In a plural society the sections are not segregated; the members of the several units are intermingled and meet as individuals; the union is not voluntary . . . and the union cannot be dissolved without the whole society lapsing into anarchy.*

By the time M. G. Smith discovered the British Indian Civilian and attempted to fit him into his Caribbean islands, South Africa had fallen out of grace and the situation about the American Negroes had immensely changed due to the Supreme Court decision of 1954 and the vigorous federal aftermath. Smith therefore castigates Furnivall for "some theoretical confusion". He, however, in the light of the American Negro developments, tries to refine the other parts of Furnivall's theory so as to fit it to the Caribbean Islands. His attempt results in some real clarity regarding the concept of plural society and its application in specific cases.

With all the refinement attempted by M. G. Smith, except for the qualification arising out of his brave work that was found useful by many of those who took part in the conference at which Smith propounded his qualification and modification of Furnivall's thesis, we find at least three participants who were totally dissatisfied with it and championed the point of view adopted here, viz., that the involvement of the concept of "plural society" in the discussion of minorities problem has been disastrous. How disastrous has been the impact can best be judged from the fact that at the conference under reference one participant, whose appreciation of the complexity of the socio-cultural situation in Trinidad, one of the Caribbean islands, is seen to be keen and real, had forgotten or ignored the later qualification of the notion which Furnivall, as mentioned above, introduced about eight years after he galvanized the interested world of practical politicians and academic intellectuals with the novel charming-looking concept of "plural society". Morton Klass of Columbia University observes about Trinidad society *vis-a-vis* Furnivall's statement on the subject of "plural society" thus :

However, Trinidad society exhibits at least one additional characteristic not provided for in Furnivall's scheme. It would seem likely from Furnivall's description (pp. 303-312) that members of the culturally distinct groups making up the populations of Burma or Java are aware of, and appear to accept, the pluralistic nature of their respective societies. In Trinidad, on the other hand, this would be true only of the East Indian.

Smith was evidently convinced that even his refinement of the concept "plural society" could not stand as such; and in his contribution on Jamaican society which he made to the *British Journal of Sociology* in 1961, he used the expression "pluralistic framework".<sup>55</sup>

Furnivall's admission that his plural society does have features which distinguish it from a confederation quoted above implies that he is aware that the Burmese situation of plurality is not one promulgated or even acquiesced in by the Burmese. And if a more direct reference to such non-acceptance was desired it is provided by him in the same book from which Morton Klass has quoted to infer non-mention or non-specification or absence of recognition of plurality. He says,<sup>56</sup> after describing the interests of Europeans, Indians and Chinese separately :

For Burmans, on the other hand, the country was the home of their national traditions and aspirations. There were cross-currents, racial, political and economic, but the main issue in political affairs was the conflict between Capitalism and Nationalism, with European businessmen and Burmans as the protagonists on either side, and with the Indian and Chinese sections generally in loose alliance with the Europeans.

Lloyd Braithwaite, Leonard Broom and David Lowenthal brought in important points against the concept of plural society, showing that it is almost too nebulous for use in anthropo-sociological studies, even with the refinement sought to be introduced by M. G. Smith.

Braithwaite,<sup>57</sup> who quotes from Furnivall's essay "Tropical Economy" (about 1944) the four traits categorized by him, logically begins by pointing out that "*the notion [of plural society] was transferred from the field of economics, where the 'dual economy' of Western enterprise and traditional native production formed a striking contrast*". He further observes that "in a sense every society has pluralistic aspects", and that "the mere existence of cultural pluralism does not necessarily threaten the existence of the social order", and further that "*societies can be characterized by the number of values, that are shared as desirable by all; in so far as they are diverse, we can speak of cultural pluralism*". He points out that Furnivall has tended "to misunderstand the existing hierarchy of values by stressing the equality of the plural elements in the situation and has "overlooked one of the basic problems in the integration of the society". Further the assumption that the integration in a heterogeneous society is essentially different and more difficult than that in a so-called homogeneous society

<sup>55</sup> *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 83, p. 859; *British Journal of Sociology*, 1961, "Pluralistic Framework of Jamaican Society".

<sup>56</sup> *Colonial Policy and Practice*, p. 157.

<sup>57</sup> *Annals of N. Y. Acad. of Sc.*, Vol. 83, pp. 817, 821, 822, 823-24. Italics mine.

leads to the conclusion that "a culturally diverse community", or in Furnivall's terminology a "plural society", is "essentially unstable which is patently untrue as amply testified to by the caste-society of India". Braithwaite characterizes the caste-society as "the most significant of the plural societies".\* As a final point of criticism by Braithwaite, I may note his description of the concept of plural society as contrasted with the unitary society. In fairness to Furnivall and his admiring users or expounders I should like to say that they would pose "homogeneous society" and not "unitary society" as the opposite of "plural society"—"relative and limited", "*all national societies, even the most homogeneous of them*", showing "*significant regional ethnic, rural-urban and social class differences among themselves*".

Broom<sup>54</sup> delimiting the concept of "plural society" observes: "A society is not a plural society just because it contains populations from more than one racial or cultural origin. *Diversity is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for the plural society. Not all, and perhaps not most, nations made up of differing populations are plural societies*". He instances Canada as a specimen of plural society. The United States he contends "affords both positive and negative illustrations" of a plural society, of its Negro and White components respectively. "It is a plural (or dual) society" in respect of its Negro component, while in another, in respect of the white ethnic minorities, it is not so. And this differentiation he contends follows from the fact, that though "the culture of American Negroes deviates less from the modal American types than do some immigrant cultures", the "*mechanisms of isolation and social control, both internal and external*", are much stronger and more elaborate than those operative against the immigrant Whites. The "cleavage between the Negroes and whites" is "the most durable and institutionalized". Contrasting Canada with Australia he holds up the former as "a good case of a plural society because it is so exactly the converse of the ideal-typical nation state. *The two major populations are distinguished by almost everything but race: language, religion, territory and culture.*"

The example of Canada is sometimes offered along with that of Switzerland as typical of federal solutions of multi-national states. Broom's characterization of Canada as a plural society appears rather unorthodox. I shall, therefore, present here a few observations made by Professor Everett C. Hughes in his now famous study of Canada, first made in 1943 and reprinted a number of times. About social contacts between the French Canadians and "their English compatriots" Professor Hughes<sup>55</sup> says: "The French may be affected by the presence of the English; but, if they are, it

\* I think Braithwaite is wrong in characterizing caste-society as a plural-society, but I cannot enter into argument about it here.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 880-85. Italics mine.

<sup>55</sup> *French Canada in Transition* (ed. 1965), pp. 143, 169, *American Sociological Review*, 1963, pp. 879-891. Italics mine.

is not by intimate and informal social contacts repeated over a long time and touching diverse classes and elements of the population." Though both communities follow the Christian calendar "*on no great-day do they celebrate in common ceremony an equal and unaffected loyalty to symbols whose meaning is the same for both*". As Professor Hughes says it very correctly, "They are ceremonially separate peoples". In his preface of 1963, Professor Hughes<sup>60</sup> has summarized the consequences of the long-drawn-out plural society co-existence thus:

*The leaders of minority thus [the Afrikaners in South Africa] did not have to advocate the break up of a major industrial economy by political separation, as French-Canadian separatists do, at least by implication.*

As to the solution of the problems created by the presence of national or all-round minorities through federalism or "national federalism" proposed by Janowsky, what Brown says is worth noting by all who are so eager to protect "so-called" minorities within a state, national by endeavour and choice or by historical or dynastic accident! He observes:

*. . . in a plural society the problem of diversity has been resolved by adjustments that presume the continued separate identity of significant population elements and a specification of limited spheres of contact, especially in the market place and in politics.*

David Lowenthal<sup>61</sup> is even more destructive of the concept of "plural society" and appears to me to be on academically safe ground in his position. Convinced of the observable fact that complex modern societies are pluralistic, carrying within them varieties of socio-cultural diversity he asks the question, "How large must an institutionally distinctive minority be to qualify the whole society as plural rather than merely pluralistic?" and adds: "It appears to me that non-plural societies grade imperceptibly into plural ones." He contends quite logically that if a grouping were "*altogether plural . . . it would not be a society at all, but only an assemblage of functionally unrelated communities*". Comparison of intensity of diversity between societies is almost impossible as no one has "devised a formula for adding up different sorts of diversity". Altogether, therefore, the concept of plural society is a will-o'-the-wisp, alluring social passengers into a quagmire!

The most important point, however, that emerges from this discussion, either purely theoretical or largely practical, by reference to the currently working States is that groups, call them by whatever name you please, if afforded protection of entrenching themselves, tend to use it to make them-

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. XIV. Italics mine.

<sup>61</sup> *Ann. N. Y. Ac. Sc.*, 83, pp. 786-94. Italics mine.

selves permanent privileged pockets within a State, to create all kinds of tensions, and, to that extent, to impair the social health of the nation community of which they are components!

One participant at the conference mentioned above deserves special attention and that is Charles Wagley who jointly with Harris, had published only a year or so before the conference a book on minorities. This book entitled *Minorities in the New World*, to which I have referred above more than once, has been acknowledged to be a competent study of the minorities in the Americas, including their problems. Wagley's views on the subject may be considered to have greater authority than those of the other participants in the conference. As the pronouncement is clear and definite I shall quote only two remarks which clinch the issue about the validity and utility of the concept of plural society. It is very refreshing to find Wagley fixing up the context of Furnivall's delineation of plural society. He says:<sup>62</sup>

*It seems to be not fortuitous that Furnivall described plural societies in the colonial regions of the south-east Asia, where numerical strength of the population, the distinctiveness and the variety of cultural traditions, as well as the colonial policies of the European nations themselves have acted as barriers to the emergence of new national institutions and values.*

In the end he doubts the utility of the concept as applied to the Caribbean region and makes the significant point that "there is a regular gradation of plurality affirming that Caribbean societies like the societies of Brazil and the United States had "already gone through the stage of a plural society" even more than the Mexican society.

Rupert Emerson<sup>63</sup> writing, as a political historian, on "the rise to self-assertion of Asian and African peoples" in his *From Empire to Nation*, published in 1960, devoted a whole chapter to the consideration of the operation of the principle of self-determination in plural societies. Speaking of J. S. Furnivall as "the principal herald" of plural society he characterizes it, as of course described by Furnivall himself, as "held together by the cash nexus and dominated by economic forces" and as one having "neither a common social purpose nor moral restraints on the drive for economic gains" with "a few well-to-do white men at the top" and "a small number of white functionaries policemen, and soldiers". One of the examples of plural societies Emerson takes up for study is pre-Independence India with British rulers prepared to leave and the Muslims and the Hindus as the contenders for the right to rule.

Professor Emerson instances the case of the Muslims as "the type of indeterminate relationship of peoples to nations with which they are in

<sup>62</sup> *Annals of New York Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 83, p. 780. Italics mine.

<sup>63</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 182-3, 329-59.



some fashion associated", another version of it "being that of the Ukrainians" in the U.S.S.R. His appraisal of "the crux of the matter in a plural society" being that it is "not one people which is determining itself but two or more" is but a paraphrase of Furnivall's dictum about the disruptive nature of such a society. His application of this realization of the nature of a plural society to the task before the UN quite correctly emphasizes the dilemma that is inherent in the application of the two principles, that of self-determination by a people and that of equal-rights of peoples, to drive his view home that in the cases of plural societies the two or three or more people who form the plural society will have to be accorded the right to separate statehoods. The complex tribal societies of many parts of Africa, many of which were units under colonial rule of the white people come under this category and principle. Emerson's treatment generally views plural societies in a right perspective. However, there are evidences here and there of a lapse into a wrong one. Thus, when he points out defects of majority decision in a plural society he uses the expression "mixed" society as an alternative. Similarly in his reference to Karl Deutsch's tests as measures of integration worked out in his *Nationalism and Social Communication* wherein post-partition India figures, as pertaining to "plural societies" demonstrates the lurking confusion. And in a later pronouncement on the subject, he<sup>64</sup> goes further while attempting to refine Furnivall's concept. He says: "In a somewhat different sense from that in which J. S. Furnivall originally used the term, the African countries tend to be plural societies marked by the absence of any identifiable and coherent social will." What he should have actually said is that some of them were conglomerates rather than societies, lacking in "identifiable social will" as they did.

J. A. Laponce, a strong advocate of almost extreme minority rights, having veneered his views with an ethical varnish, and mostly speaking of federalism, has still at the back of his mind the making of a plural society. Concluding his treatment of government structure for the protection and satisfaction of minorities he observes:<sup>65</sup> "In so far as they preserve pluralism at the governmental level, such devices as reservation of seats in parliaments or cabinets for minorities, instead of being on democratic privileges, may be necessary to the existence of democracy in a plural society." That is also how he can speak of either "multi-racial, multi-lingual or multi-religious" states or societies.

Even M. G. Smith, in connection with the discussion of the West Indies in 1959, had defined "plural society" so clearly that one would have expected writers like Laponce to renounce its use in contexts like the one in the above quotation. Smith<sup>66</sup> says: "A plural society exists only *when there is*

<sup>64</sup> Karl Deutsch and Foltz, *Nation-Building*, 1963, p. 109.

<sup>65</sup> *The Protection of Minorities*, 1960, pp. 2, 110.

<sup>66</sup> *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 83, p. 915. *Italics mine.*

a small dominant group that is preoccupied with maintaining power over culturally discrete sections of a society. *If there are many groups that share in the government and power*, then a simple plurality exists." He instances Java where "simple plurality exists". Coleman and Rosberg,<sup>67</sup> who have studied the societies and nations of Tropical Africa, too reserve the term "plural society" to designate a state "whose political elite is an alien ethnic or cultural minority". And this usage is the only correct one. For as Hans Morgenthau has said: "Society means consensus concerning certain moral and social issues"<sup>68</sup>, and so-called plural societies lack them.

Cultural pluralism, cultural autonomy or national federalism, or "federal nationalism", to give the proposal, or the Central European experiment of resolving tensions due to the presence of linguistic, ethnic or national minorities in the midst of national States, its proper name, did not achieve the desired ends. And as far back as 1950 John De Francis, a writer on Chinese problems, who looked upon "federalist" nationalism "with its ethnic diversity and its accompanying regional feeling as not necessarily divisive or incompatible with a healthy nationalism" concluded that "attempts to divorce language and politics by *conceding cultural autonomy by rejecting all political nationalism have not been notably successful*".<sup>69</sup>

Only three years before, A. H. Hourani,<sup>70</sup> while discussing minorities in the Arab world, had stated the consequences of such minority treatment in the more positive terms thus:

Even if everything possible is done to improve the relations between communities, *there must always remain certain "tensions" between men who profess different beliefs on the most fundamental questions, as also between those whose life and thought find expression through different languages.*

Elie Kedourie,<sup>71</sup> writing on nationalism in 1960, plainly asserts failure of cultural autonomy to solve the problem of national minorities which must tend to seek "national" independence, causing all the tensions on the way that one has heard of. He says: ". . . nationalists consider that political and cultural matters are inseparable, and that no culture can live if it is not endowed with a sovereign state exclusively its own . . . *These factors always render cultural autonomy by itself a precarious and illusory settlement of nationalist demands.*"

<sup>67</sup> *Political Parties and National Integration in Tropical Africa*, 1964, pp. 686-7.

<sup>68</sup> *Politics Among Nations*, p. 270

<sup>69</sup> John De Francis, *Nationalism and Language Reform in China*, 1950, pp. 214-16. Italics mine.

<sup>70</sup> *Minorities in the Arab World*, 1947, p. 124. Italics mine.

<sup>71</sup> *Nationalism*, 1960, pp. 116-17. Italics mine.

## CHAPTER

### 3

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND MINORITIES

The legislator quite ignorant of the conclusions or even of the work in progress of contemporary sociology may be a danger, just as the political philosopher, equally ignorant, is an ignorant as touching his own data of experience.\*

GEORGE E. G. CATLIN

IN THE LAST CHAPTER, I have mentioned the views expressed by some of the elder statesmen of Europe and European and world experience that the protection of minorities, national minorities at that, in view of the behaviour of some of them in the inter-war period, should be secured through a guarantee of human rights for individuals and not for groups. I also briefly narrated the plea made by Janowsky in 1945, on the other hand, for better protection of the national minorities through a guarantee of group rights, the particular form satisfactory to his way of thinking being named "national federalism". I should have named this particular mode of accommodating national minorities, however, as "federal nationalism", distinguishing the State-form which implements Janowsky's plan from the usual States born out of the nationalist upsurge of 19th century that are commonly known as national states.

The same year in which Janowsky published his plea for federal nationalism, Dr Louis Wirth<sup>1</sup> contributed what is quite clearly the first pronouncement by a professional sociologist on the problem of minorities in general. He was well aware of the new movement of cultural pluralism. For he says: "Indeed, cultural pluralism has been held out as one of the necessary preconditions of a rich and dynamic civilization under conditions of freedom." Cultural pluralism to Professor Wirth was but "another expression for the toleration of differences."<sup>2</sup> And tolerance was characterized by him earlier as "the suspicion that the other fellow might be right".

\* George E. G. Catlin, *Political and Sociological Theory and its Applications*, p. 101.

<sup>1</sup> Ralph Linton, *op. cit.*, pp. 355-63, 68-9. Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> *American Sociological Review*, 1948, p. 13.

He appears also to have been convinced of the recent recognition that *"varying religious beliefs and cultural traits need not be a threat to national solidarity and are not necessarily disruptive of national loyalty"*. However, he was fully aware of the fact that groups that claimed "cultural autonomy" generally demanded not merely equalization of opportunity in economic and political field, but more, equality with the majority community. He also acknowledged that subordination of minority ethnic and racial groups "results in great cost to the whole society". On the other hand, he knew full well that minorities demanding and receiving pluralist treatment scarcely ever stopped there but used it as only a "way station on the road to further developments", the adjustment to the larger social order required of the individual and of minority groups being scarcely made.

In his more weighty pronouncement from the presidential chair of the American Sociological Society made in 1948, Dr Wirth was much less sure about the correctness of his statement regarding obstacles to national solidarity created by "the rise of self-conscious racial and cultural minorities which has proceeded parallel to the spread of the ideal of equality and the institutions of mass democracy through over larger areas of the world". And he was compelled by his newer conviction to make the following observation about his own country, U.S.A.:

The great obstacles encountered by those who attempted to achieve in the face of prejudice and discrimination a national solidarity sufficient to see our nation through the recent war, should recall to all of us the reality of the existence of minorities in our midst.

Dr Wirth's verdict on the solution of the minority problem made in the treaties at the end of the First World War, which laid "the emphasis upon groups rather than individuals" is adverse. He, therefore, says categorically that the right of self-determination in the post-Second World War world must be guaranteed "not merely to nations or ethnic groups but also to the individual men and women" and that if "a personal bill of rights for all inhabitants" is not provided for in "the coming peace", "one of the most tragic lessons of the last peace will have been lost". With all that, however, he opines that *"ethnic, linguistic, and religious differences will continue to divide people"*.

Dr Wirth's inclusion of the right of self-determination, as an individual right, it appears to me, is more questionable than his passport for ethnic-group rights. The doctrine of self-determination must be handled and applied with great circumspection. Such a right guaranteed to individuals can be used by a group to double-cross the majority against which it claims and secures that right. Dr Wirth's recommendation may then be summarized as pleading for a Universal Declaration and International Guarantee of Human (individual) Rights.

On 10 December 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which does not contain any reference to minority or minority-group. During the three years that had elapsed between the birth of the UN on 24 October 1945 and the adoption of the Declaration, more often than once the question of including a complex of rights of minorities was mooted. Article 15 of the Declaration guarantees to all individuals a right which is virtually the same as was meant in Dr Wirth's recommendation of the doctrine of self-determination being applicable to individuals. It runs:<sup>3</sup> "(1) Everyone has the right to a nationality. (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality."

Outside the preamble, which mentions "every individual" and also society in the expression "every organ of society", as the agencies for promoting and even extending the cultivation of the Human Rights vouchsafed in the Declaration, the words "community" and "society" occur twice each, and in Article 26, "nations, racial or religious groups" are mentioned. I shall quote the relevant Articles in their order:

Article 22: "Everyone, as a member of the society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, *through national effort and international cooperation* and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of *the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of personality.*"

Article 26: "(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and *higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.* (2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace. (3) *Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.*"

Article 27: "(1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits. (2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interest resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author."

Article 29: "(1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible. (2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such

<sup>3</sup> Inis Claude, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-76; Gaius Ezejiakor, *Protection of Human Rights under the Law* (1964), pp. 85-96, 259-63; UN, *Minorities*, E/CN. 4/Sub. 2/85, pp. 1, 23-5, A. H. Robertson, *Human Rights in Europe* (1963), pp. 1-2, 8. *Italics mine.*

limitations as are determined by law solely for the purposes of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and *general welfare in a democratic society*. (3) *These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations,*" which is, of course, peaceful existence without causing any tension.

The use of the two words "society" and "community" in these Articles raises the presumption that the grouping connoted by the term "community" is different from the grouping meant by the other term. And this presumption is further strengthened by the more or less close juxtaposition of these words in the most important of the Articles—from the point of view of the national society, the nation-State, of which the individual who exercises his rights and freedom vouchsafed by the Universal Declaration is a citizen—viz., Article 29. There "the general welfare in a democratic society" stands superior and prior to the individual's "duties to the [his?] community". "Community" in the context must mean a sub-section, a smaller or closer unit, within the larger circle of "society" which is described as "democratic", to characterize its nature, as distinct from the totalitarian or the dictatorial one.

Here we have to draw upon the valuable but rather abstruse analysis and discussions of sociologists to shed light which may or may not be accepted as authoritative by publicists, who in the last resort are the tribunal that sits in judgment over matters of public policy like the one involved in the implementation. The authority of sociologists is likely to command respect if the literature of the UN on the specific subject is first put to an analytical test. In 1950, Trygve Lie, the then Secretary General of the UN, carried out his task of preparing a monograph on definition and classification of minorities in a laudably academic fashion and provided us with definitions of both society and community in the brochure<sup>4</sup> that he prepared.

"Communities", according to it are "groups based upon unifying and spontaneous (as opposed to artificial or planned) factors essentially beyond the control of the members of the group (such as blood, culture, proximity, etc.). Examples of communities are families, tribes, *persons sharing the same culture*, etc. The components of a community are united by affinity rather than by their voluntary decision to establish such a group". Communities, it avers, develop "wherever individuals live together and acquire, to a greater or lesser degree, distinctive common characteristics such as *manners, traditions, modes of speech, and feelings of solidarity*". "Society, on the other hand, is established by the deliberate or voluntary action of its members, who associate themselves for the purpose of undertaking certain activities. A "society" is an organization of social beings for the pursuit of a common interest. Examples of societies are political parties, cultural

<sup>4</sup> UN, E/CN. 4 Sub. 2/85. Italics mine.

institutions, groups formed by contract, sports club, economic corporations, States etc.” However the Secretary General in the very next paragraph speaks of a “national community” by which he can mean nothing but a nation-State, and affirms that as a “wider community” it may and does include “many different kinds of smaller communities, such as different religious or linguistic groups, social classes, and in some cases even different cultural groups”. In this statement what is described as the wider community is a State, i.e., a society in terms of the definition of society given earlier!

Communities are distinguishable not only as wider and narrower but also as of many kinds, “differing as to the number of individuals included, the number of activities comprised”. They can further be distinguished by reference to the end-product of community-living, i.e., to “the intensity and breadth of the feeling of solidarity”. Communities overlap too. One can then speak of multi-community society, just as we have MacIver and other sociologists speaking of multi-group society. In this connection of overlapping of communities, Lie for the first and last time, gives illustrations. His illustrations include among communities “a family community”, “a neighbourhood community”, “an area community”, “a national community”, “a regional community”, and “even such a larger, more loosely defined community as the circle of Spanish-speaking people, English-speaking people, or Western culture” and also “social classes”, and “cultural groups”.

Further on, Trygve Lie speaks of the nation as “one of the main types of community”, one with a high degree of maturity, which is then declared to be “the result of an historic integrative process”. It is by virtue of this process, Lie goes on to affirm, that many groups, which had once separate existence and were almost independent of one another, were brought together and “united by an intense and active solidarity”. In living together as members of one unit these groups then “acquired common habits, customs, traditions and ways of life”. Even with this achievement the erstwhile separate groups held together as a unit cannot be given the full designation of “a nation” unless there “exists a [common] goal to pursue in the present and in the future” and the individuals and groups comprised under the compound unit regard it and in “active solidarity” pursue it as a common task to be accomplished by them on co-operation and concert.

Trygve Lie who thus speaks of “a nation” as a “community” which has a common task and endeavour pursued by its members, whether individuals or groups, in “active solidarity” next speaks of the State as a society and also as “integrator of the Nation”. Thus the State is both a “society” and the virtual creator of a “nation” which is, according to him, a highly mature community, i.e., the widest and the deepest (?) “community”.

This resulting proposition clearly picks out the weak point in the dis-

inction attempted to be made between community and society. A way must be found to obviate the difficulty. Here Lie conveniently introduces the distinction he wishes to make out in the categories of States. And that is that the State may be either (1) a national State or (2) a multi-national State.

According to him a national State is one "in which the State frame is largely co-extensive with the nation". It may be a State "*in which several nationalities have been integrated*" and "acts as a factor, (a) for promoting *common solidarity among all* [?] the individuals and groups within the nation, and (b) for developing an entirely new [?] and more comprehensive [?] nation". It is this type of State that is an "integrator", or virtual creator as I have put it, of a nation or "the nation". Lie designates such a State as a "multi-national" State, though he does not head any section of his brochure with that caption or shows it as a distinct category as he lists the other one, that of "the national State".

So much is he convinced of the reality or at least the logicity of this category of multi-national State that he further divides such States into two kinds or types: In one kind of the "multi-national" States, "the State reflects the culture of the predominant nation, whilst the other nations are considered as minorities". The other type is formed by those States which being multi-national "do not reflect the culture of a predominant nation, but are neutral in so far as the various nations submitted to their jurisdiction are concerned".

There is much in this statement of Trygve Lie that needs a critical appraisal but here at least I must refrain from entering on such a task in order to follow the natural course of the topic that is the subject-matter of the chapter. I would like to confirm here that in view of the usage of the terms "society" and "community" in this statement by Lie,—though according to the general practice of various writers on Social Science topics the term "community" has meant a closer group, either linguistic, ethnic or religious—it is envisaged in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as one comprised within a larger group, a society, whose democratic nature and provision of educational and cultural opportunities, constituent individuals are entitled to enjoy to the utmost of their capacity within the ambit provided by that society. The society's overall interests must be the final arbiter of their provision by it and the individual's enjoyment of them. In the expectation of the implementation and enjoyment of the guaranteed rights the individual has to keep in mind that he has duties to the society of which he is a member, though the primary community of which he is a member is a group, which is, in other words, characterized as a minority.

Unfortunately the corpus of duties of an individual citizen and the minority community has not been laid down. And that is a defect. The old League of Nations' guarantee to minorities had prescribed certain specific duties like that of loyalty. The Constitution of Yugoslavia very properly



entitles Chapter V as "The Rights and Duties of Citizens". It cannot be too much insisted that rights must be accompanied by, or even must be made contingent on, the performance of duties, though it may be difficult to lay down specific measurement of performance or even to specify duties. Article 32 of the Yugoslav Constitution reads: "It is the duty of every citizen to work according to his abilities, he who does not contribute to the community cannot receive from it." Second part of Article 33 reads further: "It is the duty of citizens to perform conscientiously the public duties to which they have been elected or which are entrusted to them."

The Constitution of the U.S.S.R., too, has a whole Chapter headed "Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens". And Article 130 says: "It is the duty of every citizen of the U.S.S.R. to abide by the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to observe the laws, to maintain labour discipline, honestly to perform public duties and to respect the rules of socialist intercourse." Article 131 further makes it the duty of every citizen "to safeguard *and fortify public socialist property* as the sacred and inviolable foundation of the Soviet system, *as the source of the wealth and might of the country, as the source of the prosperity and culture* of all the working people"; and it declares *persons committing offences against public property to be enemies of the people*. In Article 133, the last of the Chapter, it lays down that "*to defend the country is the sacred duty of every citizen*".<sup>5</sup>

In due course a body entrusted with the task of working for the implementation of human rights and freedoms as also to advise on their extension was created by the UN, known as the Commission on Human Rights. The Commission at its very first session decided to establish a subsidiary agency known since then as the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which came into being on 28 March 1947 and held its first session in November-December 1947. It consisted of twelve members, one of them being Mr. M. R. Masani of India.<sup>6</sup> According to its initial terms of reference, the Subcommission was

expected to examine what provisions should be adopted in the definition of the principles which are to be applied in the field of the prevention of discrimination on the grounds of race, sex, language or religion, *and in the field of the protection of minorities*, and to make recommendations to the Commission on (Human Rights) on urgent problems in these fields (as well as) to perform any other functions which may be entrusted to it by the Economic and Social Council or the Commission on Human Rights.

<sup>5</sup> Amos J. Peaslee: *Constitutions of Nations*, Vol. III (2nd ed.), pp. 760-62; 498-500. Italics mine.

<sup>6</sup> Inis L. Claude in *International Organization*, 1951. Italics mine.

From the fuller account of the vicissitudes of the proposal for special rights and positive services in the protection of minorities in the main organs of the UN, kindly provided by Inis Claude in his book *National Minorities*,<sup>7</sup> it appears that the position of the Subcommission on the Protection of Minorities was quite anomalous, there being no reference to minorities or even to groups and group-rights in the Universal Declaration. And this peculiar birth-mark of this Subcommission should be borne in mind in evaluating its endeavour in the cause of minorities.

As a matter of fact the Commission on Human Rights at its third session, (May/June 1948) had "accepted a proposal, *initiated by India, United Kingdom and China [Kuomintang]* and *strongly supported by the United States, to omit from the declaration any reference to the rights of minorities to use their native tongues and to maintain educational and cultural institutions.*"<sup>8</sup> At its second session it had included in its draft two tentative proposals, the one made by its own drafting committee and the other put up by the Subcommission on Minorities Protection.<sup>9</sup> The former read:

In States inhabited by a substantial number of persons of a race, language or religion other than those of the majority of the population, persons belonging to such ethnic, linguistic or religious groups shall have the right, as far as compatible with public order, to establish and maintain schools and cultural or religious institutions, and to use their own language in the Press, in public assembly and before the courts and other authorities of the State.

The other proposal was almost identical except for the addition of "and script" after "language" and of "and security" after "public order".

The third session (December 1948) of the General Assembly of the UN, however, had three proposals before it, submitted by the delegations of Denmark, Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R.

The Russian proposal was not essentially different from that of the drafting committee of the Commission mentioned above and the Danish one was even less extensive. The Yugoslav proposal was more radically drastic and more like the thin end of a wedge capable of a divisive role than a bridge facilitating social wholeness. It needs to be fully quoted here, particularly in view of the so-called Seminar on the Problems of a Multi-national Society held under the auspices of the UN by and in Yugoslavia in 1965.

Of the three Articles proposed by the Yugoslav delegation, the relevant ones were:

<sup>7</sup> Chapters 12 and 13.

<sup>8</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 159. Italics mine.

<sup>9</sup> UN *Minorities*, pp. 23-25 and f.n.s.

(1) Any person has the right to the recognition and protection of his nationality and *to the free development of the nation to which he belongs. National communities which are in a State community with other nations are equal in national, political and social rights.* (2) *Any national minority, as an ethnical community, has the right to the full development of its ethnical culture and to the free use of its language. It is entitled to have these rights protected by the State.*

The General Assembly rejected these proposals but in doing so it adopted a resolution on "Fate of Minorities", thus committing itself for the first time to consider groups, and not merely to confine itself to individuals, in respect of human rights and freedoms for which the UN stood and may in future stand.

The resolution stated that "the United Nations cannot remain indifferent to the fate of minorities" and forwarded the proposals of the three delegations to the Economic and Social Council requesting it *inter alia* "to ask the Commission on Human Rights and the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to make a thorough study of the problem of minorities, in order that the United Nations may be able to take effective measures for the protection of racial, national, religious or linguistic minorities".<sup>10</sup>

At the same session (third) of the General Assembly in 1948, the Genocide Convention was tabled for consideration. In the debate that ensued on it in the Sixth (Legal) Committee of UN, the main discussion was centred round the provision in it for the prevention of what is termed there as "cultural genocide", i.e., "the brutal destruction of the specific characteristics of a group." The Soviet bloc and a number of Asian Arab States strenuously fought against its deletion. Inis Claude, who informs us that India was ranged on the side of its deletion, also states her reason in his opinion for it. He appears convinced of it for he says that India's "objection to the inclusion of cultural genocide was clearly related to the fact that *Pakistan, an ardent supporter of the provision, proclaimed that it could hardly wait to haul its neighbour before a tribunal as a violator of the cultural rights of the Moslem minority*". The Committee wisely voted for the deletion of the provision, and the General Assembly followed its lead in its resolution despite the efforts of the U.S.S.R. and Venezuela to upset the decision of the Sixth (Legal) Committee.<sup>11</sup>

In 1949 the Western powers had agreed "with extreme reluctance" to accept the demand of Yugoslavia, supported by the U.S.S.R., for the incorporation into the draft treaty of "provisions establishing linguistic and cultural rights for the Croatian and Slovene minorities in Austria." But later the U.S.S.R. having withdrawn its support, Yugoslavia managed in

<sup>10</sup> UN, *Minorities*, p. 24, f.n.s. and p. 25. Italics mine.

<sup>11</sup> Claude, *National Minorities*, p. 155. Italics mine.

its negotiations with the Austrian Government to have included in the Austrian Constitution an appropriate provision which represented mutual understanding and satisfaction.<sup>12</sup>

The Subcommittee on Protection of Minorities largely at the suggestion of Mr M. R. Masani of India who was then its Chairman, took upon itself the task of drafting "a special convention for the protection of the rights of minorities".<sup>13</sup> In 1951 the Economic and Social Council, on the other hand, on the initiative of the United States and France strongly supported by Britain and India, resolved to discontinue the Subcommittee and requested the Secretary General to advise on methods to enable the Council to pursue efficiently "its efforts to abolish all forms of discrimination and to protect minorities". The General Assembly voted to keep the Subcommittee which then held its Fifth Session in September-October 1952.

I must at this stage note the development that took place in Europe, so to say outside the ambit of the United Nations, though in conformity with and in furtherance of the objectives of UN.

On 4 November 1950, the Committee of Ministers of the European Assembly and Community signed the Convention (European) for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The United Kingdom, the first of the 15 European countries ratifying it, adopted it on 8 March 1951. Greece ratified it in 1953, Turkey in 1951, Belgium and Italy in 1955, Austria in 1958, and Cyprus on 6 October 1962. It became operative on 3 September 1963.<sup>14</sup> The noteworthy fact about this Convention, is that there is only one mention of "national minority" and that is in connection with an individual's association, though three or four countries comprised in it have national minorities in their midst.

There are only two out of the total 66 Articles in which there is a reference to "community" or "nation or national", viz., 9 and 14. Article 9 guarantees the right to freedom of thought, conscience, practice of religion etc. "either alone or in community with others and in public or private". Clause 2 of the same Article declares that "*freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, for the protection of public order, health or morals, or for the protection of the right and freedoms of others*". Article 14 secures "the enjoyment of the rights and freedoms" of the Convention "without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status". Thus association with any national

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 190.

<sup>13</sup> Claude in *International Organization*, 1951, p. 306.

<sup>14</sup> A. H. Robertson, *Human Rights in Europe*, 1963, pp. 1-14; Gaius Ezejiakor, *Protection of Human Rights under the Law*, 1964, pp. 97-109. Italics mine.

minority is secured for an individual of a national State without any loss or diminution of rights and freedoms.

It cannot too strongly be emphasized that the absence of any provision for minority rights in this Convention of nation-States, in some of which very marked and strong national or ethnic minorities have existed and have been the source of not only severe tensions but even violent conflicts and wars, and in most of which there are religious minorities, is a clear warning to all those who talk glibly of minority rights and quite often in unrestrained terms.

Particular attention has to be drawn to the fact that the question had long been debated and was being considered in the various organs of the European Community since 5 September 1949 when first "the importance of 'the wider protection of the rights of national minorities' was stressed".<sup>15</sup> The Legal Committee which held this view took up Article 25 of the United Nations draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as its basis, and decided to add one more right. The expanded provision was as follows:

Persons belonging to a national minority shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, and as far as compatible with public order, to enjoy their own culture, to use their own language, to establish their own schools and receive teaching in the language of their choice or to profess and practise their own religion.

The matter was referred to the Committee of Experts on Human Rights appointed by the Committee of Ministers which had not completed its deliberations on the rights of minorities till almost the end of 1963. As regards "local autonomy" which figures so much in all the discussion on minority rights, and which was made too much of as a charmingly sweet and innocuous proposition in UN *Seminar* (ST/TAO/HR/23) of June 1965, the Committee of Minorities "had *early resolved not to concede it on the ground that it was not a fundamental human right*".<sup>16</sup>

Things were moving in the world of the UN and its various specialized agencies, both the Economic and Social Council, and the Commission on Human Rights as well as its creation, the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities having their annual sessions. The General Assembly of the UN, by its resolution of 1904 at its 18th Session of 20 November 1963, proclaimed the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. By another resolution at the same Session the General Assembly requested the three above-mentioned special agencies that a draft international convention on the subject-matter of the Declaration should be given the highest priority to enable the General Assembly to consider it at its next session. Accordingly the

<sup>15</sup> A. H. Robertson, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-58.

<sup>16</sup> A. H. Robertson, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-58. Italics mine.

Subcommission prepared a draft convention which the Commission on Human Rights considered at its 20th Session, 17 February—18 March 1964, and adopted with some amendments,<sup>17</sup> the principal one being the omission of Article VIII of the original, the text of which is given at pp. 15-17 of UN, E/3970 (Economic and Social Council, Official Records, 37th Session, Resolutions, Supplement No. 1).

The General Assembly adopted the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination on 21 December 1965. The text as thus adopted by the august body appears in two parts: Part I embodies the seven Articles put up by the special agencies with some changes; and Part II, comprising Articles 8 to 25, all designed to make the convention operative and to provide for supervision.<sup>18</sup> The most important modifications introduced are two. One concerns the prohibited grounds of discrimination. They are consistently stated as "race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin", "descent" and "national origin" being the two grounds added to the other three mentioned in the draft of the Convention put up by the Economic and Social Council as proposed by the Commission on Human Rights.

The second change introduced by the General Assembly in the Draft Convention—even more significant, may the most important, in our context—is the addition of a new Clause 1(c), in Article 2. It reads:

Each State Party undertakes to encourage, where appropriate, *integrationist multi-racial organizations and movements and other means of eliminating barriers between races, and to discourage anything which tends to strengthening racial division.*

Clause 2 of Article 2 is also relevant for us. It reads:

State Parties shall, when the circumstances so warrant, take, in the social, economic, cultural and other fields, special and concrete measures to ensure the adequate development and protection of certain racial groups or individuals . . . . These measures shall in no case entail as a consequence the maintenance of unequal or separate rights for different social groups after the objectives for which they were taken have been achieved.

I shall now revert to Article No. 8 in the Draft Convention proposed by the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which were deleted by the Commission on Human Rights when it discussed the draft for finalization at its 20th Session<sup>19</sup> in 1964. The

<sup>17</sup> UN, E/3873, E/CN.4/874.

<sup>18</sup> UN, *Monthly Chronicle*, January 1966, pp. 103-115.

<sup>19</sup> UN, E/3873, E/CN.4/874, pp. 57-59.

dropped out draft article read:

Nothing in the present Convention may be interpreted as implicitly recognizing or denying political or other rights to non-nationals nor to groups of persons of a common race, colour, ethnic or national origin which exist or may exist as distinct groups within a State Party.

France, India and the Philippines had proposed that the text put up by the Subcommission should be replaced by the following:

Nothing in the present Convention may be interpreted as affecting in any way the distinction between nationals and non-nationals of a State in the enjoyment of political or other rights, or as amending provisions governing the exercise of political or other rights by naturalized persons; nor does anything in this Convention impose a duty to grant special political or other rights to any groups of persons because of race, colour or ethnic origin.

The views expressed on this amendment in the Commission Session are thus summed up in the UN document referred to:

It was felt by certain representatives that *if the intention was not to grant special political rights to any group because of race, colour or ethnic origin that might be acceptable*, but the texts tended to insert a reservation clause for which there was no need since the texts neither added to nor detracted from the provisions of the Convention. *Moreover, the texts might give the impression that they were concerned with matters such as the degree of political autonomy or the right of self-determination to which groups might legitimately be entitled.* It was pointed out, however, that the texts did not concern *the right of peoples to self-determination or state that special political rights must be granted in certain cases* but simply that States Parties were not obliged to grant the rights concerned, so that there was nothing to stop States from granting those rights if they so desired.

As this discussion proceeded, India and the Philippines were prepared to drop the proposed amendment but France went on with it. However, at the end, on the notion of the representative of Austria the Commission Session decided to delete Article No. 8 from the Draft Convention and that, too, by an absolute majority, 12 voting for deletion and only 2 against it. Six abstentions out of the twenty representatives present are not at all considerable in the voting-and-decision-pattern current in this great international organization of mankind.

As the 20th Session, at which the Commission on Human Rights dis-

cussed and finally adopted the modified Draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Commission had before it Draft Declaration and Draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance.<sup>20</sup> The General Assembly had by its resolution No. 1781, passed at its 17th Session on 7 December 1962, asked the Commission, through the Economic and Social Council, to prepare a draft declaration and a draft convention for the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance, in time for the Assembly to consider it for adoption, not later than its 20th Session. The resolution of the Assembly further had invited member-States to submit their comments and proposals concerning the draft Convention by 15 January 1964. The Commission in its 19th Session (1963) proceeding with the matter, on the one hand requested the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to prepare and submit to it a preliminary draft of such a declaration, and on the other asked the Secretary General to invite Governments of member-States to submit their proposals in the matter in time for the Commission to consider them at its 20th Session. Having been provided with all this material in time, only the Governments of Burma, Chad, China, Finland, Indonesia, Israel, Lebanon, Nigeria, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom having sent in their proposals and comments, the 20th Session of the Commission considered the proposed draft and formed "a working group" to prepare the final draft. The Economic and Social Council at its 37th Session held in July-August 1964 reported to the General Assembly, forwarding all the papers till then ready, that difficulties encountered in the work of preparing an appropriate draft had prevented the Commission from completing its work in time and requested it to decide on the further course in the matter at its 19th Session.<sup>21</sup>

The 9th item on the agenda of the 20th Session of the Commission on Human Rights (17 February to 18 March 1964), included the Report of the 16th Session of the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities,<sup>22</sup> referred to as E/CN. 4/873. We are told that Chapter VII of the same "related to the protection of minorities" and that it was considered by the Commission. We are also informed about the documents and papers the Subcommission had before it for guidance in preparing the report. The first and foremost among them was, of course, "the memorandum prepared by the Secretary General listing and classifying special protective measures of an international character for *ethnic, religious or linguistic groups* (E/CN. 4/Sub. 2/221) and the compilation of the texts of those international instruments and similar measures of an international character which were of contemporary interest and which

<sup>20</sup> UN, E/3873, E/CN. 4/874, pp. 69-81.

<sup>21</sup> UN, E/3970, Economic and Social Council, Official Records 37th Session, Resolutions, Supplement I

<sup>22</sup> E/3873, E/CN. 4/874, pp. 93-95. Italics mine.



provided special protective measures for *ethnic, religious or linguistic groups* (E/CN. 4/Sub. 2/214)".

We further learn that the Subcommission in its resolution 6 (XVI) of the session had requested the Secretary-General to publish his memorandum and the compilation as one publication, so that it could be available to the public and "would contribute to the understanding of the problems involved". The Commission on Human Rights considering the said resolution was informed by the Secretary-General that the cost of publication, which would be \$2500, could not be met from the allocations. Some members of the Commission thought that the financial implications of the proposal made it inadvisable to adopt the resolution. And we are further enlightened as to why the publication could not come about in the observation that "It was also felt that the publication envisaged would have rather a scientific than a practical character [!]" The said resolution of the Subcommission sponsored by the Austrian representative in the Commission was rejected by 4 votes to 3, 13 representatives abstaining from voting!

While this was the record of the Secretary-General and the Commission on Human Rights, the 37th Session of the Economic and Social Council which had before it these proceedings had another document<sup>23</sup> of curious interest in the context, of which more later. Here it is suffice to mention that it contained a sanction for a "global" seminar "on the problems of a multi-national society" which was to cost the UN about sixty thousand dollars! The seminar was duly held at Ljubljana in Yugoslavia from 8 to 21 June 1965, i.e., about a year after the abovementioned performance of the Commission and the Council. And the world received its published report post-haste in the document ST/TAO/HR/23 in the first week of January 1966!

Mr John P. Humphrey, the Director of the Division of Human Rights deputized for the Secretary-General at the Seminar.

The story of the organization of this rather curiously styled and, as it will be presently clear, suddenly extended seminar as told by Mr Humphrey at the outset is not quite clear and communicative; but I shall give it as narrated there. The "seminar on the multi-national society" is stated to have been organized under an old General Assembly resolution, No. 926 of the 10th Session of the General Assembly and an almost equally old resolution of the Economic and Social Council, No. 605 of its 21st Session. Further "the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights had previously [?] expressed the wish that the Secretary-General organize a seminar on world-wide basis under the advisory services programme". On the invitation of the Government of Yugoslavia to hold "such a seminar to consider the multi-national society, and the endorsement of the Economic and Social Council in resolution 1017 (XXXVII)" i.e., the one

<sup>23</sup> E/3882 / and Add. 1, pp. 1-2.

passed at its 37th Session, at which, too, there was the report of the Sub-commission on Minorities and its resolution regarding the publication of the relevant documents on which it was based, the Secretary-General proceeded with the arrangement for it. He desired to be advised, which advice he received in due course, as to the participating countries etc. to be invited in view of the "budgetary limitations". Among the invitees I find one glaring omission, looking to the nature of the topic for discussion and deliberation, i.e., Brazil which is supposed to have solved its so-called multi-national problem fairly satisfactorily.

The rather garbled account of the actual happenings in the process of the organizing of this seminar, the ambiguous and unusual terminology of the topic, combined with my fairly recent perusal of the Report of the 20th Session of the Commission on Human Rights led me to dive deeper to light up the events or stages in the process. Pages 1 and 2 of the Document E/3882/ and Add. 1 of the Official Records of the 37th seminar of the Economic and Social Council offered me this information: The Secretary-General reported to the Commission on Human Rights that out of the three *regional seminars* provided for by the Council he had accepted invitations from the Governments of Yugoslavia and Mongolia to act as host countries for *a seminar for the European countries*,\* and for a seminar for the countries and territories within the geographical scope of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East respectively. The seminar in Mongolia which was to be on the participation of women in public life, as it turned out, would have cost more than two and a half times the sanctioned allocation. About the seminar in Yugoslavia which was to be on the problems of a multi-national society, the Secretary-General reported that *the host Government liked the seminar to be organized on a world-wide instead of a regional basis*.\* He pointed out to the Commission an old resolution of the Council No. 684 of the XXVI Session requesting him 'to keep in mind the possibility of holding 'an international seminar' at some future date on *a subject of universal interest*'.\* He buttressed himself and his proposal to accept Yugoslavia's invitation for a seminar beyond the previously thought out and sanctioned extent and reference by drawing upon the fact that the General Assembly in its resolution No. 1261 at its 13th Session had noted the abovementioned resolution No. 684 (XXVI) of the Economic and Social Council. Having thus got the extension of the topic and of the extent sanctioned he could get the appropriation already earmarked for the projected European seminar almost doubled, limiting the number of the so-called "global" seminar to 30 or 35 participants! As the Mongolian seminar, on what to me appears to be an even more important topic, was already elbowed out, its allocation of funds was free and there was no difficulty in getting the appropriation for the Yugoslavian

\* Italics mine.

"global" seminar of 30 or 35 participants almost doubled!

It may be pointed out in extenuation of this rather unusual procedure of suiting of the nature and extent of a projected and planned seminar at the bidding of a host-state that the Economic and Social Council was long exercised over the fact of not having its desire for a seminar fulfilled for long. As far back as 1961 it<sup>21</sup> had referred to the resolution of the General Assembly authorizing the Secretary-General to organize seminars on human rights at the request of any State member of the UN and had noted, evidently with concern and distress, that no member-State had yet requested the Secretary-General to organize a seminar dealing with the prevention of discrimination or the protection of minorities and had called the attention of State members to the aforementioned General Assembly resolution.

Unfortunately, however, that is not the only curious feature of the seminar reported in the Document ST/TAO/IIR/23. The very title of the topic invites more than stringent criticism. To begin with the definite article "the" suggests a particular society and not any society to which the adjective qualification "multi-national" can apply. As a matter of fact the agenda and the discussion both are quite clearly such as pertain to any so-called "multi-national society". Perhaps the spill-over or the drag on of the original topic of the proposed seminar, viz., the European society, can explain the use of the definitive article.

The expression "multi-national society" to say the least required an elucidation or specification. The expression is not met with in the UN brochure on Definition and Classification of Minorities, the scientifically prepared memorandum by Trygve Lie, the then Secretary-General of the UN, in 1950. Trygve Lie, having proceeded with his task in a scientific manner and having consulted both Sociologists and a large amount of relevant Sociological literature—he has appended to the Document E/CN.4/Sub.2/85 an exhaustive list of selected books which fills sixteen pages in small type, almost equalling the space devoted to the definition and classification of minorities, the subject-matter of the brochure—has defined the basic concepts like "society", "community", "nation", and "state" and not confined his intellectual endeavour to the definition and classification of "minorities".

Trygve Lie says: "In examining the concept of 'nation', special attention must be given to the difference between 'community' and 'society' (or 'organization') and to the influence of the State in building up a nation." That Lie wholly depended on Tönnies and therefore landed himself in the solecism of equating "society" with organization is an example of how even a highly conscientious official can go wrong in matters which are strictly of academic intellectual discipline. That society is not only organization, that "political parties, cultural institutions, groups formed by contract,

<sup>21</sup> *International Organization*, 1961, p. 181.

sport clubs, economic corporations, States, etc." do not exhaust "society" should be clear to anyone who reads Professor L. T. Houbhouse's article on Sociology published in 1916 or thereabouts in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* or to those who look up *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* of Robert E. Park and E. W. Burgess published in 1921 or Professor R. M. MacIver's *Community*, first published in 1916 and reprinted more than once till 1926.

Professor MacIver's change in the title of his book, when he revised and published it first as *Society, its Structure and Changes*, then as mere *Society*, should convince anyone that as far as professional sociologists are concerned "Society" is a much wider concept than organization and that it is the all-inclusive unit in which total social and individual living is carried on.

Writers on Economics have used the word in what would appear to be an equally wide signification. Thus while R. H. Tawney told us about the Acquisitive Society more than 40 years ago, during the intervening period Professor J. K. Galbraith acquainted the world with the Affluent Society, Maclelland with Achieving Society and Robert L. Heilbroner dwelt on the making of Economic Society. Anthropologists have brought to our notice both the ages and the stages of Society. While the Britisher Sir Henry Sumner Maine was content with unravelling the web of Ancient Law and expounding the evolution of the society of contract from that of status, the American Lewis Morgan could not content himself with anything less than Ancient Society. His compatriot R. H. Lowie, more than half a century after him, wrote on Primitive Society. Writers on Political Science were not the persons to be left behind in this race for utilizing the services of this all-inclusive term, Society. Whereas Professor Graham Wallas had uncovered the Great Society to us a few years before Tawney could do the same with the Acquisitive Society, Professor MacIver and his associate Page<sup>25</sup> could, in 1950, speak of not only of complex but also of "greater society".

Before the spate of "society" in use, we were aware of Animal Societies but in the post-"sputnik" era Walter Sullivan<sup>26</sup> appraised us not only of "global society" but also of "sister societies" in the "galactic community" and also of "space-faring societies".

Trygve Lie then speaks of "the nation as a community" and "the state as a society (organization)", remarking that "most sociologists and political scientists consider the State as a society or organization" (paragraph 26), adding in the next paragraph, what is in effect a very stringent limitation of "society" when equated with "state". He says: "The State is an essential part, but never the whole, of the social structure included in the nation. It is an organization with special attributes, special instruments, and special

<sup>25</sup> *Society*, Ed. 1957, pp. 443, 463.

<sup>26</sup> *We Are Not Alone*, 1964, pp. 239, 240, 257-260, 264, 265, 279-81, 288-89.

powers . . . . From any viewpoint, however, the law defines the sphere of the State." Somewhat paradoxically he further (paragraph 31) informs his readers that "the State often acts as an important integrating factor in building up a nation."

Lie's view about the relation between the state and the society is not shared by sociologists. And the best testimony of this fact is what Professor MacIver, who combined in himself the expertise of both disciplines, Sociology and Politics, has to say. He devotes<sup>27</sup> a whole section in his book *Society, an Introductory Analysis*, headed "The Functions of the State in a Complex Society" and speaks of the State as "a distinctive form of association" and as "a limited agency" and points out the "social functions in the performance of which the state is at a disadvantage as compared with other agencies". He warns against the confusion of state with community insisting that the "State is but one form of social organization and is an agency though with a particularly wide range".

The "study-group" of the Royal Institute of International Affairs<sup>28</sup> in 1939 has this to say about society and nation: "It is true that in every society sufficiently well integrated to deserve the name of a nation, there is a common conception, ill-defined and partly irrational, but deeply felt, of what constitute the vital interests of the nation." Professor E. H. Carr,<sup>29</sup> who was the chairman of the "Study-group", writing in 1945 stated:

Nevertheless the nation is something far more than a voluntary association, and it embodies in itself, though overlaid with conventional trappings, such natural and universal elements as attachment to one's native land and speech and a sense of wider kinship than that of family. *The modern nation is a historical group. It has its place and function in a wider society, and its claims cannot be denied or ignored.*

The Sociologist Louis Wirth<sup>30</sup> affirmed in 1918 the distinction between the State and Society thus:

Modern society exhibits two major aspects. On the one hand, it consists of organized groups, ranging from informally constituted intimate groups to highly formalized organizations, such as the modern corporation, the union, the church and the state. On the other hand, there are the detached masses that are held together, if at all, by the mass media of communication.

Another Sociologist, with a greater bent towards Politics—as the sub-

<sup>27</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 13-4, 453, 455, 457, 461.

<sup>28</sup> *Nationalism*, pp. 245.

<sup>29</sup> *Nationalism and After*, p. 39. Italics mine.

<sup>30</sup> *American Sociological Review*, 1918, p. 5

title of his book *The Quest for Community* and its subject-matter would demonstrate—told his readers in 1953 that “State and society must be sharply distinguished” and asserted that “despite the considerable number of writers who make State and society synonymous, there is actually no more warrant for making the State a generic term to include all types of association than there is for making religion or kinship”.<sup>31</sup> Professor R. C. Angell, in his contribution to the UNESCO brochure on *The Nature of Conflict* (1957) stressed the need for creating a wider and more inclusive social system incorporating “the national states” in order to make a world society. It is within a social system or a society that a state effectively works. And his particular recommendation was some years later, i.e., in 1965, endorsed by Dean Wagenen<sup>32</sup> as the sociological view of international organization, who quotes another well-known writer on International Relations and Politics, Stanley Hoffmann, in justification. Hoffmann speaks of “the relations between individuals or groups across national boundaries” as “transnational society”.

G. E. G. Catlin<sup>33</sup> who speaks of a “World Society” as a “Great Society” and not as Greater Society as Professor MacIver, who is quoted above, does, informs his readers that “states are fundamentally power organization of Society”. It must be remembered that to Catlin “Politics is a study of human society as controlled and organized”. He defines “State”, which term he takes care to assert “is of no earlier use than in the Italy of the 15th century”, almost in the Spencerian strain, to be “the organization of certain human beings . . . for the primary function of repressing violence”. The distinction between “society” and community is pin-pointed as between “extensive and intensive forms of human grouping” and the term “association” is reserved for “a society organized for some specific purpose”. Ernst B. Haas,<sup>34</sup> an earnest solver of the problems of International Relations and the UN, pondering over the mutual relations of the Welfare State and Society, though affirming the “norm-generating capacity of society” stresses the fact that “welfare-oriented society, is artfully manipulated by the state, *which no longer merely responds to the demands of society but now tells society what to demand*”, though “*the state is part of the society from which it has sprung, and prospers and decays as society prospers and decays*” and “*far from being a thing apart from society, is created by society*”.

Trygve Lie used the term “society” in a very restricted sense, which could have given a totally wrong direction to his further specification of other entities like the State; but evidently it did not happen so. He very correctly distinguished two types of States—I say correctly because his

<sup>31</sup> Robert A. Nisbet, *The Quest for Community*, pp. 99, 249-50, 283-4

<sup>32</sup> *International Organization*, Summer, 1965, p. 816.

<sup>33</sup> *Systematic Politics*, 1962, pp. 57, 61, 292-3, 310, 371.

<sup>34</sup> *Beyond the Nation State*, 1964, pp. 45, 508-09. Italics mine.

main task was concerned with the definition and classification of minorities and not also with that of State, monistic or monolithic as against pluralistic, or totalitarian as against democratic States and such other distinctions in States did not matter in the context—one type being called the National State and the other, very naturally and logically, the Multi-national State, the latter being divided into two “principal categories”.

Lie defined a “multi-national” State as one “formed by two or more nations, existing as different communities, each of which is aware of—and desires to retain—its own distinguishing characteristics”. In the first category of a “multi-national” State “the State reflects the culture of the predominant nation, whilst the other nations are considered as minorities”, while in the second category, the State “does not reflect the culture of a predominant nation” but is “neutral in so far as the various nations submitted to its jurisdiction are concerned” (paragraphs 32 and 33).

In the background of this statement authoritatively made in an UN publication, which forms the legal and natural precedent and charter for further elaboration, it is more than painfully strange to find Mr. John P. Humphrey, the Director of the Human Rights Division using the new expression, “multi-national society” without any explanation, to build his superstructure of minority rights, though under the rather spacious rubric of “problems” Professor R. M. MacIver<sup>35</sup> had long before coined the expression “multi-group society” to designate such a society.

Before proceeding with the statement of academic usage in the intervening period in this respect, I must draw the reader's attention to the fact of the United States having been characterized a “nation of nations” almost sixty years before Mr Humphrey chose to describe a state with more than one nation or nationality within its jurisdiction as “multi-national society”. Booker T. Washington, the great Negro leader, spoke of the Negroes in the States as “a nation within a nation”<sup>36</sup> and Louis Adamie, a Balkan immigrant into USA, gave<sup>37</sup> further currency to the notion of the United States being “a nation of nations” in 1914. However, none has so far described the American society as a “multi-national society”. President Woodrow Wilson said half a century ago: “America does not consist of groups. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American”.<sup>38</sup> Nathan Glazer writing in 1954, on the other hand, confidently asserted: “We know that the fragments of real nations scattered about the country will be worn away.” Robin M. Williams who had published a monograph on Inter-group Tensions, (of course in America) in 1947, returning to the subject-matter, fortified with an elaborate investigation carried out in the intervening period,

<sup>35</sup> *Society, An Introductory Analysis*, pp. 218, 295, 621-22.

<sup>36</sup> Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, p. 629.

<sup>37</sup> Morroe Berger and others, pp. 159, 160, 163, 165, 172, 173.

<sup>38</sup> Quoted by Iris L. Claude, *National Minorities* p. 81.

penned a whole chapter in his book *Stranger Next Door* (1964), entitled "Structures and Processes in Multi-group Society". He further assured his readers that "the pluralism of American society, and not the multi-nationalism of it, though it was in "a changing and conflictful condition" could not tolerate "a mosaic society of separate cultural segments".<sup>39</sup>

As for the academic usage regarding the phenomenon and the condition it is noteworthy that the authoritative "study group" of the Royal Institute of International Affairs in its report and book entitled *Nationalism* published in 1939 named the chapter dealing with the phenomenon as "the Problem of the Multi-national State". Janowsky,<sup>40</sup> a passionate advocate of special structural arrangement for the protection of minorities, speaks of only multi-national state or state structure but never multi-national society. Inis L. Claude,<sup>41</sup> later one of the well-known writer on International Relations, in his book *National Minorities*, published in 1955, also uses the expression "multi-national state" or simply "multi-nationalism". Reinhold Niebuhr, who wrote of "immoral society and moral man" so far back as 1932, speaking of the U.S.S.R. in 1959, referred to it as the "multi-national state".<sup>42</sup> G. E. G. Catlin<sup>43</sup> informs his readers that Niebuhr uses the quaint expression—one that may justify Mr Humphrey's own "multi-national society", criticized here—"multi-national nations", but does not furnish the specific page-reference to his book, *Nations and Empires*, which Catlin draws upon for it and throughout mistitles it as the *Structure of Nations and Empires*! Catlin himself lapses in his recent books, *Systematic Politics* and *Political and Sociological Theory and its Applications*, into using the expression "plural society", though he is aware of the more common and appropriate expression for the particular feature of society intended to be conveyed by it as "pluralistic society".<sup>44</sup>

In an earlier chapter I have offered a brief summary of the history of the notion of pluralism, cultural pluralism and also of the concept of plural society. It is seen from that statement that the society which J. S. Furnivall, and following him others, designated "plural society" was such that it should have been called multi-national society. For the particular society which was dubbed by that name was actually a state composed of three national societies. But in the literature dealing with the problems of these so-called plural societies that expression is not met with. Professor Rupert Emerson,<sup>45</sup> dealing with the happenings and the problems of African people who were under colonial powers and have emerged as sover-

<sup>39</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 353-86.

<sup>40</sup> *Nationalities and National Minorities*, pp. XX, 34, 37, 40, 42, 106-7

<sup>41</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 63, 64, 88, 90.

<sup>42</sup> *Nations and Empires*, 1959, p. 169.

<sup>43</sup> *Systematic Politics*, p. 321.

<sup>44</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 79-90, *Systematic Politics* pp. 135, 191, *Political and Sociological Theory etc.*, pp. 79, 90.

<sup>45</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 182-3, 329-59.



eign nations breaking through the colonial cordon, refers to them as "plural societies" and sometimes alternatively as "mixed societies" but not as multi-national societies. After devoting a whole chapter to the principle of self-determination he has added another entitled "Self-determination in Plural Societies". In his later pronouncement on the subject, Professor Emerson<sup>46</sup> speaks of the existence of "three major levels of social and political community", viz., "the traditional societies of the past, the colonial or colonially-derived *structures* of the present, and the several *Pan-African aspirations*". Further, in the elaboration of his thesis, Professor Emerson uses the word "*states*" instead of "structures" but not societies. Of Kenya, where the small tribes have opted for "a loose federal structure in order to preserve their tribal identity—and their land" he speaks as a "*state* which seemed sure to be dominated by the more numerous Kikuyu and Luo". His solecism in using the expression "plural society" only brings out in bold relief the mischief that a loose expression, whose conceptual content is not scrutinized and is used as a convenient vehicle, may do!

My fundamental objection against Mr Humphrey's use of the expression "multi-national society" is precisely the same. If the expression is paraphrased its absurdity becomes manifest. In essence it is equivalent to the expression "multi-social society"; for a nation is quite often and rightly called a society. The vagueness introduced by the use of this expression peeps out off and on in the deliberations of the participants in the Seminar.

During the discussion it is known (paragraph 61) that "several participants" distinguished "between a multi-national or multi-lingual state taking the form in some cases, of a large federal union" and "a national State with one or more resident historical [?/] minorities". What is a "historical minority", an expression once again used in paragraph 61, is not stated anywhere in the Seminar report; and paragraph 25 is devised to ward off all criticism by mentioning that "no single formula could be devised" to comprise all minorities. Of course there is nowhere a mention of the elaborate classification of minorities made on various principles by Trygve Lie in the UN document E/CN.4/Sub.2/85. And the fact is that even in that comprehensive classification one does not come across the expression "historical minority", unless one chooses to consider the minorities specified under (a) of paragraph 75 of the above-mentioned document to fit the expression. For it is stated in paragraph 77 that in regard to the minorities specified as "*descending from groups which existed before the establishment of the State*" (75a) "*any claim to special measures for the protection of [their] distinctive characteristics should be considered in relation to historic facts and in particular the manner in which the State was consti-*

<sup>46</sup> Karl Deutsch and William Foltz, *Nation-Building*, 1963, pp. 97, 103, 105. Italics mine.

*tuted*”.\* Later, participants talk of not only “multi-national societies” but also of “multi-ethnic societies” and “multi-national and multi-ethnic States”; and the participants stated the distinction in paragraph 64 by characterizing as “multi-national societies” those “countries whose peoples were indigenous to the territory but different from each other”,\* and by defining as “multi-ethnic societies” those “countries whose inhabitants were primarily immigrants or of immigrant stock”. The wording, whether used by the participants themselves or by Mr Humphrey must have been meant to make the United States a “multi-ethnic society” but not a “multi-national” one, while Nigeria and most other Africa’s new States and nations “multi-national societies”.

I take it that what the participants meant was the distinction they would make regarding minority groups and consequent classification of national societies. Those States or nations which have minority groups that are fairly recent immigrants are “multi-ethnic societies” and those whose minorities have been resident along with the majority for a very long time so that it was not known if one or the other, the majority group or the minority group, was the earlier resident in the dominion, are “multi-national societies”. Even thus, however, the case of U.S.A. will not be a clear one for being classed as “multi-ethnic society”, for all the White Americans, including the descendants of the original Puritan British stock are immigrants and later immigrants than the original (Red) Indians.

The full irony of the title of the topic, which the Seminar, invited by and being held in Yugoslavia, was to consider, comes out when one finds that in the official publication of Yugoslavia published in 1965 and entitled *Facts about Yugoslavia*, Yugoslavia is characterized as “a multi-national country” and not as “a multi-national society”!

One finds, almost at the very start of the discussion of the first item on the agenda of the “seminar”—which was “measures which should be taken to ensure the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms to all without discrimination”—in paragraph 21 the record that “most speakers tended to agree that the principal matter to be considered was the extent to which rights formulated in Constitutions and the domestic legislation of States were effectively enjoyed and the measures, national and international alike, which should be taken to ensure the implementation of those rights and to hasten the solution of problems still outstanding”. And in the next sentence, by way evidently of elaboration, but as if the elaboration was an afterthought, occurs the following expression which closely indicates that “the problem of minority rights” did not form “part of the problem [problems?] of the multi-national society.” It reads: “In this connexion, the problem of the multi-national society and the problem of minority rights could be treated jointly, since both involved basically similar factors of a political, economic, legal, social, and cultural character.”

\* Italics mine.

The contents of the next paragraph No. 22, clearly demonstrates that in the opinion of the "several speakers", who "stated that the most acute problems of multi-national societies consisted of the elimination of any form of colonialism which might still exist and of discrimination and national or racial inequality", "multi-national society" meant the same as "the plural society" of J. S. Furnivall and others and not the State among whose constituent groups there exist distinct ethnic or national or cultural groups. Indeed these speakers—the same (?) or some others (?)—drew attention to "the need for distinguishing between nationalities and minority groups of a given national origin [?]", the latter having "to be considered as part of the population of the State under whose jurisdiction they came".

As far as I can understand the content, and there is no internal aid available for correct interpretation, the model of a multi-national society these speakers had before their mental eye is that of an African nation under colonial rule, formed of a number of different tribal groups, or an Eastern and Central European State with the old world national groups of the Slav, Magyar and other ethnic stocks.

There is thus a jumble of variant forms of multi-ethnic, multi-national States and of pluralistic societies, of minorities that are purely immigrant nationalities or races, and of the remnants of colonial empire-builders and their proteges, whose problems are tried to be studied—not studied but even solved or rather, their rights are being strongly entrenched—very slight consideration being given to the differences in circumstances and in moral claims. Needless to say, the States among which these groups, sought to be protected or in reality being insulated and stabilized, cannot receive anything like the consideration they deserve.

The observations of Mr Humphrey, the Director of the Human Rights Division, are still further intriguing. Nay, they are such as to excite our painful surprise and are not calculated to enhance our respect for the great organization of humanity or to add to its prestige and moral authority. Particularly jarring is Mr Humphrey's jibe at the Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, in the light of what I have stated from the UN documents themselves of that organ and its superior organ the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr Humphrey in his speech at the opening of the "seminar" said (page 40):

It is true that there exists in the United Nations a special body whose name and terms of reference mention the protection of minorities. I am referring to the Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, one of the most distinguished organs of the United Nations. But while this Subcommission has, during its nearly twenty years of existence, done some very important work indeed on

the prevention of discrimination, *it has hardly begun even to discuss the protection of minorities*".\*

The expression under italics, is patently wrong; for as mentioned earlier in this chapter, almost three months before this seminar, which Mr Humphrey opened with this caustic speech, the Economic and Social Council of the UN had on its agenda a document (E/CN.4/873) for consideration which contained a whole chapter dealing with the protection of minorities!

Mr Humphrey took one or two steps further when he went on to tell his international listeners not only that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the UN in 1948 "did not even mention the question /of the protection of minorities/" but also to impress upon them his view that "with the one important exception of the Genocide Convention" the protection of minorities was not dealt with "in the increasingly important body of international legislation [?] dealing with human rights . . . adopted under the auspices of the United Nations and its specialized agencies". As earlier stated this statement is a flat contradiction of the state of affairs which records persistent and prolonged endeavour in the cause evinced by the adoption or near adoption of drafts of conventions or covenants against religious and/or racial discrimination!

What is worse is that Mr Humphrey, who should have at best been content with exhorting the participants on the moral or pressing need for the consideration of "measures to be taken to ensure protection to various kinds of minorities", or rather of solutions to be offered for the problems of "multi-national societies" in terms of the topic proclaimed for the Seminar, instead put a question to them, implying a certain course as tacitly adopted by the great organization, the UN, which Mr Humphrey considers to be undesirable or wrong. He said: "*Does this mean that the philosophy of the United Nations is one of assimilation and integration?*" \*

And though Mr Humphrey in his perorational fashion tried to answer the question by leaving it to be answered by "the participants at this conference" we know it to be mere rhetoric. For the agenda of the "seminar", the so-called conference "which was already fixed", did not contain an item which could evoke discussion on the proper attitude to be adopted by the UN towards the question of the protection of minorities.

What is still worse—and this from the purely intellectual and scientific viewpoint, and therefore from the point of view of the fundamental basis of the seminar, whose authority can only be commensurate with the intellectually and scientifically correct viewpoint operative in the seminar—is that Mr. Humphrey quite casually equates integration with assimilation, as if both the processes and states were acknowledged to be identical by thinkers and students whose duty and right it is to pronounce an opinion on the subject! We have seen in the first chapter that far from this being

\* Italics mine.

the case, both Sociologists and Political Scientists make a clear distinction between them. It will be manifest from the statement that the process and condition called integration is a concept introduced by Sociologists not more than 50 years ago and that particularly by American Sociologists.

The participant representation, too, leaves much to be desired. The point of view of the Communist countries and their associates on the matter of multi-national states has throughout been known to favour all fissiparous groups within capitalist societies. In particular, Yugoslavia is known to have recorded its predilection in no ambiguous language. Her report on the United Nations and its work, made in 1959, as Professor R. M. Mac-Iver<sup>47</sup> tells us, "makes a strong case for the rights of minorities and it objects to the attitude of countries that refuse to permit minorities to recognize their ethnic links with their mother country. It considers that *these rights should be recognized even if the minorities themselves do not demand the preservation of their ethnic features and traditions.*" Of the 51 participants and alternate participants there were as many as 16 from Yugoslavia, 5 from U.S.S.R. and 2 from Czechoslovakia and one from Austria which is known to have treaty provisions<sup>48</sup> for Yugoslav residents in the State. Of the 20 working papers submitted as many as 8 were from these four countries. And the manner of recording the "views", conclusions or opinions, being anonymous and vague in enumeration, one begins to wonder about the utility of the seminar as a scientific and impartial contribution to the calm and all-sided consideration of the problems of multi-ethnic or multi-linguistic or multi-national States.

The solicitousness of the Director of Human Rights Division of the UN appears to have overflowed in conceiving this seminar and preparing its agenda. For the 6th and the last item on the agenda reads: "Equal treatment of economic regions within a country". I take it by "country" is meant a State or, in Mr Humphrey's terminology, a "multi-national society". But in the actual deliberations the item was connected with "measures to be taken to ensure the realization by ethnic, religious, linguistic or national groups, of special rights necessary to enable them to preserve their traditions, characteristics or national consciousness". This connection comes about natural only in those cases where the groups sought to be given special rights are concentrated in certain specific regions of a multi-national State, particularly so if those regions happen to be economically backward. Gratuitously one of the participants branched off, evidently because specific comments and proposals were not possible on the item, into a homily on the nature of regional culture and of cultural change and put down what he called "guidelines" in paragraph 129! I shall leave this item out of our consideration as almost irrelevant or as a loose tag, in my

<sup>47</sup> *The Nations and the United Nations*, 1959, p. 19. Italics mine.

<sup>48</sup> A brief summary of the Treaty of 1955 is provided by J. A. Laponce in *The Protection of Minorities*, 1960, p. 37.

discussion of the contribution made by the "seminar".

In selecting proposals made at the "seminar" for discussion here, one has to be guided by the volume of opinions of the participants and their affiliations. As for the affiliation, unfortunately as all record, except that of the leaders of the discussions of the individual items on the agenda, is anonymous it is not possible to take it into account. Even as regards the volume, as the record is in very vague terms, with no indication of specific number anywhere but only with such expressions as "a number of speakers or participants", "some speakers or participants", "certain speakers or participants", "several speakers or participants" and "most speakers or participants" in one case (paragraph 21), or with such passive constructions as "was recognized", "widely recognized or agreed" and "generally recognized or conceded or agreed", one cannot gauge it properly. I shall, therefore, make my comments first on those proposals which are recorded as having been "generally recognized etc.", "widely recognized" or as having been made by "several speakers or participants", "many speakers or participants" and "most speakers or participants".

The paragraphs covered by these varied expressions are: 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, 38, 40, 41, 47, 56, 57, 61, 71, 72, 76, 77, 86, 107, 114-16 and 119. Besides these, paragraphs 50, 54 and 63 containing matter which is sponsored with the expression "the seminar agreed" must be considered.

The relevant portions of paragraphs 20 and 21 have already been drawn upon. Paragraph 22 embodies the proposal or proposals in regard to "peoples under colonial domination" and their right to "self-determination", besides the suggestion regarding distinction to be made between "nationalities" and "minority groups of a given national origin". Paragraph 27 airs the views of "several participants" on "certain forms of political organization" as offering "better possibilities than others for the assurance of human rights of all citizens", "some speakers" suggesting "a federal system adjusted to group requirements" as the one having special advantages. In paragraph 30 the "opinion of many participants" ultimately asserted that "the primary requirement was not so much liberty in the abstract as equality of opportunity in everyday life", which is quite clearly a laudable, a highly desirable desideratum but not susceptible to regulation from outside.

"Several speakers" voiced the still more palpable platitude in paragraph 32 that "if a majority wished to attain or continue enjoying genuine equality, humane treatment and democratic rights, it was bound to safeguard the rights of the minority" and that therefore "the minority question was primarily a problem of the majority"!

"Many of those taking part in the discussion" went a step further in their zeal for the so-called minorities and asserted (paragraph 33) that "certain groups, particularly voluntary immigrant minorities" should be assured by State authorities "employment, the elimination of health problems, decent standards of living and the removal of linguistic barriers".

They further volunteered the free and specious advice to all States which have the magnanimity to permit strangers to migrate into their dominion that "encouraging a minority to preserve, if it so wished, its own cultural heritage, the State would in the final analysis be the principal beneficiary"

The temerity of "several participants" went further as recorded in paragraph 34 and called in question the assumption of "the existence of a homogeneous majority" pointing out that "over the last century several States had developed through immigration to the point where there was no specific majority of specific ancestry so that in such States all groups were in a sense minorities"! This pompous argument is too thin not to expose its speciousness and its real motive-force, viz., the securing of special rights of colonial powers that have had to retreat from Africa and certain parts of Asia under the pressure of rising nationalism!

As a pleasant change and a marked contrast to the over-liberal and even platitudinous suggestions of the earlier paragraphs, paragraphs 38 to 43 embody what appear to be well considered views of "many speakers" on the implementation of the Covenant on Human Rights already promulgated.

The four agenda items numbered two to five specify the four special rights that in the opinion, evidently of Mr Humphrey and of many of the participants of the seminar, must be guaranteed to the so-called minorities. The items numbered 2 and 4, i.e., "the right to use their own language in everyday life, in courts of law, and in public or assembly" and "the right to establish autonomous educational institutions", whose discussion was led by participants from India and Malaysia respectively, do not carry any summary of the discussion or a resume of the proposals by the leaders of the discussion and thus stand distinguished from the other items of the seminar.

The discussion of "the right to use their own language etc." is recorded in 22 paragraphs, from the 46th to the 67th inclusive, and of "the right to establish autonomous educational institutions" in 17 paragraphs, from the 88th to the 104th inclusive. The seminar lingered the longest on the second item on the agenda, the "right to use their own language", having devoted to its discussion 7th to 10th meetings spread over three days.

Paragraph 47 records that "there was general agreement that a primary consideration in connexion with a group's right to use its own language was whether the group in fact claimed that right for its members and wished, as a group, to maintain its ethnic characteristics." While agreeing with the first part of this statement and the sentiment expressed in it, it must be pointed out that the latter part of it about the preservation of ethnic characteristics is not only immaterial but also irrelevant. Whether a group desires to maintain "its ethnic characteristics" or not, if it desires to use its language "in everyday life" it must have the right to do so without any further ado. Possibility of the dysfunctional and harmful use of

discussion of the contribution made by the "seminar".

In selecting proposals made at the "seminar" for discussion here, one has to be guided by the volume of opinions of the participants and their affiliations. As for the affiliation, unfortunately as all record, except that of the leaders of the discussions of the individual items on the agenda, is anonymous it is not possible to take it into account. Even as regards the volume, as the record is in very vague terms, with no indication of specific number anywhere but only with such expressions as "a number of speakers or participants", "some speakers or participants", "certain speakers or participants", "several speakers or participants" and "most speakers or participants" in one case (paragraph 21), or with such passive constructions as "was recognized", "widely recognized or agreed" and "generally recognized or conceded or agreed", one cannot gauge it properly. I shall, therefore, make my comments first on those proposals which are recorded as having been "generally recognized etc.", "widely recognized" or as having been made by "several speakers or participants", "many speakers or participants" and "most speakers or participants".

The paragraphs covered by these varied expressions are: 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, 38, 40, 41, 47, 56, 57, 61, 71, 72, 76, 77, 86, 107, 114-16 and 119. Besides these, paragraphs 50, 54 and 63 containing matter which is sponsored with the expression "the seminar agreed" must be considered.

The relevant portions of paragraphs 20 and 21 have already been drawn upon. Paragraph 22 embodies the proposal or proposals in regard to "peoples under colonial domination" and their right to "self-determination", besides the suggestion regarding distinction to be made between "nationalities" and "minority groups of a given national origin". Paragraph 27 airs the views of "several participants" on "certain forms of political organization" as offering "better possibilities than others for the assurance of human rights of all citizens", "some speakers" suggesting "a federal system adjusted to group requirements" as the one having special advantages. In paragraph 30 the "opinion of many participants" ultimately asserted that "the primary requirement was not so much liberty in the abstract as equality of opportunity in everyday life", which is quite clearly a laudable, a highly desirable desideratum but not susceptible to regulation from outside.

"Several speakers" voiced the still more palpable platitude in paragraph 32 that "if a majority wished to attain or continue enjoying genuine equality, humane treatment and democratic rights, it was bound to safeguard the rights of the minority" and that therefore "the minority question was primarily a problem of the majority"!

"Many of those taking part in the discussion" went a step further in their zeal for the so-called minorities and asserted (paragraph 33) that "certain groups, particularly voluntary immigrant minorities" should be assured by State authorities "employment, the elimination of health problems, decent standards of living and the removal of linguistic barriers".



They further volunteered the free and specious advice to all States which have the magnanimity to permit strangers to migrate into their dominion that "encouraging a minority to preserve, if it so wished, its own cultural heritage, the State would in the final analysis be the principal beneficiary"

The temerity of "several participants" went further as recorded in paragraph 34 and called in question the assumption of "the existence of a homogeneous majority" pointing out that "over the last century several States had developed through immigration to the point where there was no specific majority of specific ancestry so that in such States all groups were in a sense minorities"! This pompous argument is too thin not to expose its speciousness and its real motive-force, viz., the securing of special rights of colonial powers that have had to retreat from Africa and certain parts of Asia under the pressure of rising nationalism!

As a pleasant change and a marked contrast to the over-liberal and even platitudinous suggestions of the earlier paragraphs, paragraphs 38 to 43 embody what appear to be well considered views of "many speakers" on the implementation of the Covenant on Human Rights already promulgated.

The four agenda items numbered two to five specify the four special rights that in the opinion, evidently of Mr Humphrey and of many of the participants of the seminar, must be guaranteed to the so-called minorities. The items numbered 2 and 4, i.e., "the right to use their own language in everyday life, in courts of law, and in public or assembly" and "the right to establish autonomous educational institutions", whose discussion was led by participants from India and Malaysia respectively, do not carry any summary of the discussion or a resume of the proposals by the leaders of the discussion and thus stand distinguished from the other items of the seminar.

The discussion of "the right to use their own language etc." is recorded in 22 paragraphs, from the 16th to the 67th inclusive, and of "the right to establish autonomous educational institutions" in 17 paragraphs, from the 88th to the 104th inclusive. The seminar lingered the longest on the second item on the agenda, the "right to use their own language", having devoted to its discussion 7th to 10th meetings spread over three days.

Paragraph 47 records that "there was general agreement that a primary consideration in connexion with a group's right to use its own language was whether the group in fact claimed that right for its members and wished, as a group, to maintain its ethnic characteristics." While agreeing with the first part of this statement and the sentiment expressed in it, it must be pointed out that the latter part of it about the preservation of ethnic characteristics is not only immaterial but also irrelevant. Whether a group desires to maintain "its ethnic characteristics" or not, if it desires to use its language "in everyday life" it must have the right to do so without any further ado. Possibility of the dysfunctional and harmful use of

this right was mentioned during the course of discussion and paragraph 49 records that "abuse of the right to use one's own language could in some cases lead to parochialism, which would be detrimental to the development of the society."

In paragraph 50 we come across one of the few refreshingly and eminently reasonable viewpoints on the problems of minorities made at this Seminar. We are told that "the seminar agreed that the right of a group to use its own language should not be construed as an obligation on the individual members of the group, who should have the right to use and to study other languages than their mother tongue". In paragraphs 66 and 67 we are told of the discussion regarding a group's right to use its own language in courts of law and in public assemblies whether municipal, local or national. And the discussion ends on the rather obvious note that this latter right "would in practice be conditioned by the degree to which the speaker was likely to make himself understood".

The last two rights are restricted, according to the opinion recorded in paragraph 64, being not available to immigrant minorities of what are described therein as "multi-ethnic societies", as such minorities "could not be considered to carry their national rights with them to their new country".

Before considering the right of minorities to use their language in courts and assemblies, the participants expressed their views on "national official language", after listening to the actual practice in the countries of the participants and their experience. This matter is covered by the record made in paragraphs 56 to 59 and 60 to 62 inclusive.

Leaving out the distinction of federal States and national States, and confining our attention only to such States as were not federal or federated by treaty-obligations, I note that paragraph 59 quite clearly refers to India (Bharat) though the name of the country is not mentioned therein. I am unable to specify the country or countries covered by the record of paragraph 58 wherein, too, the name is not mentioned.

In paragraph 57 is recorded the concern of the participants for "the additional difficulties faced by newly independent States composed of different groups speaking a multiplicity of languages" and for the efforts of "*the various groups wishing to maintain their several languages and their cultural heritage . . . and at the same time to develop the unity of the country as a whole and to create a national identity*". Quite clearly the talk was concerned with Africa, "several participants" stressing "*the importance of developing a 'lingua franca' to serve as a medium for unifying the African continent*" \* which had been artificially divided by the imposition of colonial languages". Under the need of a country having "*to develop a readily understood means of communication and a common administrative system*" it was considered necessary that it should decide "*whether one language [from those current in the country] should be designated as the official*

\* Italics mine.

or 'link' language, or whether the colonial language should be retained either indefinitely or for a specified period".

The whole of this discussion or deliberation as recorded in paragraph 57 sounds confused or camouflaged. The whole continent of Africa is spoken of as a unit before the European powers with their colonies introduced political division and turned it into linguistic one with their different languages. In the continent as a whole five or six European languages as colonial media were current before Africa woke up to demand independence in one colony after another. Yet the participants are represented as having talked in terms of only one colonial language. The number of African languages current in the numerous tribal groups was and is very large and even the families of languages classified on the basis of linguistic affinities of the different tongues do not number less than three. Under the circumstances the participants thinking in terms of one African language as "the official or link language" for the whole continent appears to me to be so unreal and idealistic as not being capable of being entertained as a thought by reasonable participants in the Seminar. And the climax of confused thought or its representation is reached in the final sentence, precise meaning of which I am unable to understand, "It was observed in this connexion that the imposition of the use of another language might have a divisive influence rather than acting as a unifying force for national development." This rather too unreal talk very naturally was changed to one about specific nation-States of Africa and some of that evidently is recorded in paragraph 58, though no specific country is mentioned.

Continuing the deliberations, with India's constitutional provision for the official language intervening, the participants returned in paragraph 60 to the topic of "a national official language". "It was held" that "it would be advisable, after allowing a generous period of time", for the Government of a State "to establish a well-understood deadline for the use of the designated official language, the other national languages" \* being permitted to be used for official purposes during the interval. These other national languages "could be retained for everyday use after the designated language had become the official national language." \*

The intimately connected topic of "the right to establish autonomous educational institutions" was considered in a meeting which came two days after the discussion of the above item and immediately after the item of the right of Association was disposed of. The most important omission in the discussion of this item as recorded is the absence of any specification of "the autonomous educational institutions" regarding the grade of education. In so far as the expression is absolute it has to be taken to imply that the conferment of "the right to establish educational institutions" without limits as regards grade, and that minorities can establish schools, primary, technical, secondary and others, as well as institutes of

\* Italics mine.

higher learning and of the University grade. The only objection to this interpretation is the fact in paragraphs 97, 98, 100, 101, 102 and 103, only schools are mentioned and not colleges or universities. But in paragraph 94 recording "the methods and techniques used to provide educational facilities for ethnic, religious, linguistic and national groups" are mentioned "autonomous educational institutions" at all grades of education including university level. The schools, too, are mentioned as institutions meant "to impart its [that of the minority group/ heritage to the children of the group".

The third important right of the "so-called" minorities which Mr Humphrey had placed on the agenda of the seminar is "the right to develop their own traditions and characteristics autonomously", i.e., cultural autonomy whose history is narrated in the previous chapter. The groups to be guaranteed this right are again named as "ethnic, religious, linguistic or national" but not cultural. *"All participants agreed"* that the discussion of the earlier items on the agenda "had demonstrated the difficulty of recommending universally applicable measures" in behalf of the minority rights proposed, as *"the possibilities of each State in that regard depended on the degree of its social and economic development and on the structure within which that development was being pressed"*.<sup>\*</sup> In spite of this unanimous opinion which should *ipso facto* have made the participants pause before discussing the guarantee of this right, which if granted and exercised is certain to create a society or societies within a society, we are told in the next paragraph (107) that *"it was generally agreed"*, of course without any qualification, condition or exception, that not only does *"the right of autonomous action to ensure the preservation and continuity of a group's traditions and characteristics"* provide *"the surest means of protecting its collective identity"*, which is of course a truism, but also that it forms *"an integral part of its way of life"* which is, in fact, a proposition to be debated and then decided upon in the negative or in the affirmative!

As the leader of the discussion on this item of the agenda in summarizing the debate has "suggested the following conclusions" in paragraph 120, I shall not go much further but add my comments on paragraph 114 whose important substance I do not think, is represented in the "suggested conclusions" which are:

- (a) "The majority of participants were agreed that a diversity of customs and traditions could enrich the social life and economic development of a country, but certain practices prejudicial to public order, health or morals should be eradicated by education or measures of control". Evidently the participants, who offered this obiter-dicta-like advice, evidently to persons and peoples who had suffered and had worked for the liberation of the people and their countries, as to what was good

\* Italics mine.

for their countries for not only cultural health but also economic prosperity, without considering adequately and comprehensively the probable or possible difficulties their proposals might create in the way of national unification or of the creation of national identity, had forgotten, within about 48 hours, that their guarantee of cultural and educational autonomy registered in their discussion recorded in paragraphs 88 to 104 might, nay must, make education the helpmate not of the eradication of pre-judicial or unhealthy practices and customs but of their rationalization and stabilization.

(b) "The desirable special characteristics and traditions of any group could include also those relating to its economic and social organization, provided there was no conflict with the State's general development policy."

(c) "*Most participants believed that incentives should be offered by the State, even though there was no obligation in this respect, for the autonomous development of group characteristics and traditions, particularly through governmental organs entrusted with the coordination of cultural activities.*"\* As far as I am able to construe the meaning of the record in paragraph 119, which in its second sentence has it that "An interplay of cultures between the two [the minority and the majority, I take it, though the two mentioned in the previous sentence are only "indigenous minority groups" and "voluntary immigrant groups"] might in the long run result in the disappearance of certain group characteristics, but each would ultimately gain from the process of mutual adjustments", I think that this "suggested conclusion" does not harmonize with the opinions recorded in it!

(d) "The seminar was in unanimous agreement that, in the exercise of the right under discussion, indigenous groups and voluntary migrant groups should receive identical treatment." The first part of the record in paragraph 119 tallies with this. But both of them run counter to the views recorded in paragraphs 63 and 64 where the case of the latter kind of group is pronounced to be different in the matter of their language except for everyday use. It was also stated (63) that "the seminar agreed that, by *voluntarily migrating, persons in such groups expressed the wish to integrate themselves into the society and way of life of their chosen country*"!\*

(e) "Some participants felt that the question had been somewhat wrongly approached, since cultural rights were not special minority rights but an essential element of the freedom of the individual [?]".

The third sentence of paragraph 114 records an important cross-section of the participant opinion which appears to me to have escaped the notice of the summarizing leader. It is such as requires to be drawn attention to.

\* Italics mine.

It reads: "Other speakers, while generally concurring with this view [that "the guarantee should extend to such traditions and customs as did not hinder progress and, above all, to those which directly assisted it,"] thought that traditions and characteristics could not in reality be 'guaranteed' by statute, their best protection lay in universal tolerance of one's neighbour's right to be different if he so wished; and in a truly democratic society the question of special minority rights in this context never even arise".

Customs, traditions and characteristics and not the general complex called culture having been in the picture, perhaps the specific reference to some of them mentioned in paragraph 112 was not thought necessary by the summarizing leader. But I think that they are so wide and fraught with serious consequences for social solidarity in a national State that they deserve being specifically brought to the notice of the public even in a short summary of the deliberations of the Seminar like mine. The paragraph (112) reads:

Other participants urged recognition of the importance of maintaining permissible [?/] legal traditions [tribal law?/], in fields such as laws of succession, marriage, dietary laws and the like. It was stressed, however, that *the toleration of distinct juridical institutions among minority groups was conditioned by the State's general legislative policy.*

An appraisal, however brief, of the confident manner in which a number of special rights have been proposed by the participants of the Seminar and their evocation by Mr Humphrey, the Director of the Human Rights Division of the UN, has to begin with the remark that Hamlet made about his mother's second marriage with the brother of his assassinated father, that the seminar was arranged in indecent haste in view of the developments regarding the question of the protection of minorities that had already taken place under the aegis of the special and specific organ of the UN for this matter, the Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which I have briefly narrated at the beginning of this chapter.

I should add here the considered opinion of a Political Scientist, whose studies in the antecedents and prospects of national states and their problems are well-known, regarding what has been called cultural pluralism or cultural autonomy. Professor Karl Deutsch<sup>40</sup> observes:

It seems, therefore, Utopian to imagine blissful state of "cultural autonomy" where "culture" will be carried on detached from real life, *where schools will be detached from taxes and students from the need for jobs. . . . "Cultural autonomy" cannot be divorced from the personal, local, regional, or occupational autonomy of human beings . . . .*

<sup>40</sup> *Nationalism and Social Communication*, 1953 p. 80, Italics mine.

These latter "autonomies" needless to say cannot be vouchsafed to the minorities as groups within a nation-State whose overall business it is to look to these aspects of the total community. And that is why Inis Claude,<sup>51</sup> who was—I use the past tense because from his more recent contributions to the problems of International Relations I am not sure that in the fullness of his insight into the problems of nation-States and the UN he continues to hold the view as strongly—rather pronouncedly disposed towards the proposal of cultural pluralism, remarked:

There is no difficulty in establishing multi-national states. *The difficulty lies in the establishment of multi-national states whose citizens are conceptually and spiritually prepared to abandon the desire for a national state and to combine a pluralism of ethnic and cultural loyalties with a unity of political allegiance . . . .* Its [that of cultural pluralism] concepts, terminology and machinery might be adopted at the end of the war, *but the problem of alleviating the tensions of majority-minority relationships would remain.*

The reason why the panacea of indiscriminate cultural pluralism would not produce the desired result is clearly set forth by Wagley and Harris in the fullness of their study of the behaviour and treatment of minorities in the New World. They state<sup>52</sup> in their evaluation of the two approaches to the solution of the problems of minorities, assimilation and cultural pluralism, that

*assimilation should in the long run provide a sounder basis for a truly democratic society for the presence of pluralistic minority groups in a society seems always to harbor the danger of conflict and of the subordination of one group by another.*

Professor Rupert Emerson, studying the nations arising out of the break-up of European colonialism in Africa, Asia and America, in his book *From Empire to Nation*<sup>53</sup> (1960), provides one of the reasons for such a state of affairs in the psychology and political behaviour of minorities thus:

The right of self-determination endows *social entities which cannot be identified in advance with a right of revolution against the constituted authority of the state, and even to obligate the state to yield to demands of the revolutionaries . . . .* In its most extreme version the right of self-determination could mean *the right of any group of disaffected people to break away at their pleasure from the state to which they presently*

<sup>50</sup> *National Minorities*, 1955, pp. 79, 86-91. Italics mine.

<sup>51</sup> Wagley and Harris, *Minorities in the New World*, 1958, p. 294. Italics mine.

<sup>52</sup> Pp. 297-9 Italics mine.

*belong and establish a new state closer to their hearts' desire.*

It may be mentioned in this connection that according to S. F. Bloom, Marx considered nations to be societies and held that "groups of Germans in Hungary or Poland should regard themselves as Hungarians or Poles".<sup>54</sup>

Thus the over zealous approach to the problems of so-called minorities is not warranted by some of the most advanced and competent opinion on social and political problems. Much less is the indiscriminate application of a doubtfully valid viewpoint in the present state of national evolution and international needs indicated as a wise step for such an august body as the UN, which ought to show its concern for the struggling nation-States, which have been carved out of the outmoded and dubiously advantageous system of colonialism. These new states are beset with too many other problems both of economic development and political and social cohesion for their social health to have this panacea for minority problems, whose potentialities for divisiveness and anomie have been emphasized by more than one student of the problems of the so-called minorities.

The problems of the new nation-states, for example, are thus presented in a recent American study:<sup>55</sup>

A prime source of tension for the international system in the next decade is the conflict between the need of the underdeveloped countries to modernize their societies and hence undergo dislocating and even explosive social change and the need for the international system to maximize stability and hence control disruptive forces.

On the other hand, the UN by its indiscriminate patronage of multi-nationalism or multi-racialism under the guise of minority protection, is sure to autogonize the African nationalists who naturally look up on it in its application as "only the latest and most euphonious slogan for perpetuating white supremacy".<sup>56</sup> The importance of African colonial domination for the greatness and supremacy of European nations, so expressly stated by such an outstanding Political Scientist as Hans Morgenthau,<sup>56</sup> could not have failed to be appraised by African leaders.

Appreciation of such reasons has rightly led Ernst Haas, so earnest a well-wisher of the UN and such a staunch supporter of the need for the development of world community, to be apprehensive even of the proper

<sup>54</sup> Karl Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication*, 1953, p. 229.

<sup>55</sup> Quoted by Ernst B. Haas in *Beyond the Nation-State*, p. 4. From *International Stability: Problems and Prospects*, 1961, pp. 28-29 by General Electric Company, TEMPO.

<sup>56</sup> G. A. Almond and J. S. Coleman, *The Politics of the Developing Areas*, 1960, pp. 346-7.

<sup>56</sup> *Politics Among Nations*, p. 359.



and comprehensive implementation of human rights. He observes:<sup>57</sup>

The chances for expanding the human rights function [of the UN] are far cloudier . . . . Integral regimes of the future will have reason to resent and oppose international efforts to make them observe the general human rights standards enshrined in the UN Universal declaration. The Western democracies will have less reason than before to press them on this matter.

Another earnest student of International Affairs Louis Hankins, in a more pointedly specific context, in his paper on the United Nations and Human Rights contributed to the 20 years record evaluation number of *International Organization*, Summer 1965, summarizing the work of the UN in his department, eschews the topic of minorities. He is painfully conscious of the agonies and pangs the UN suffered in the birth of the Covenant on Human Rights and has poignant memories of the Eisenhower Administration of U.S.A. having "abjured any intention to adhere to" them. Like Rupert Emerson,<sup>58</sup> he, too, is aware of the attitude of new nations to the erstwhile European colonials and their "determination to extirpate the remnants of white colonialism and white discrimination".

Ernst Haas<sup>59</sup> has noted in his study of the conventions on human rights implemented through I.L.O. that "many of the colonial and former colonial powers take great satisfaction in special texts seeking to protect indigenous and tribal groups from the inroads of forced industrialization, though it cannot be said that the new nations themselves are so concerned with this aim". That the minorities to be protected through such measures as Mr. Humphrey's participants in his Seminar advocated must include the erstwhile colonial white boss, as indeed Rupert Emerson<sup>60</sup> plainly stated 5 years before the Seminar, vitiates the Seminar still further.

Hankins goes a step further, and sympathizing with the new nations, warns the UN regarding its own stability. He says:

If peace can be maintained, international stability enhanced, *nations left alone to work out their destiny, the economic and social development of nations assisted by those who have more, then the rights of individual human beings will have a chance to flourish, and the UN can play a role spreading the process, to increase these rights, to make these rights count.*<sup>61</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Ernst Haas, *Beyond the Nation-State*, 1964, p. 496.

<sup>58</sup> Karl Deutsch, *Nation-Building*, pp. 111

<sup>59</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 182.

<sup>60</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 341.

<sup>61</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 511, 512, 517. Italics mine.

Finally, however ungracious it may appear, I must draw my reader's attention to an aspect of international dealings, whether of experts or of accredited diplomats, which no less an authority on International Politics than Hans J. Morgenthau has so openly and neatly placed before the world for a good many years. He<sup>12</sup> tells his readers that it is pertinent to ask oneself one question about all writers, who, among half-a-dozen nice and desirable, almost millennial, things like fair dealing, trusting in others and keeping one's word, propound such other items as abjuration of war and protection of minorities. And that question, in plain words, would lead to doubting their sincerity, but, in euphemistic terms, would posit pure ideology "concealing the true motives of action".

<sup>12</sup> *Politics among Nations*, 1963, p. 233. The quality and authority of the thought-complex presented in this book may be gauged from the fact that during its three editions between 1948 and 1963 it has gone through nineteen reprintings!

## CHAPTER

### 4

## THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA (*BHARAT*) AND MINORITIES

This combination of constitutional and customary sources of authority bring us finally to those dimensions of community which are most clearly contrived rather than organic . . . The final pinnacle of artifact is a written constitution, as we have it in this nation, in which a specific covenant is made, the basis of the communal unity and integrity.\*

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

PROFESSOR ROBERT E. PARK of Chicago University, writing in 1939,<sup>1</sup> i.e., two years after the Congress Governments in the various Provinces had assumed power, observed: "The Government of India is likely, when and if it achieves its independence of England, to retain its imperial character, since it will continue to be a collection of ethnic and linguistic minorities." Professor Park had evidently not looked at his own country and its Constitution in the critical manner in which Niebuhr did about 20 years later as in the quotation at the top. India on her part not only achieved independence much sooner than Professor Park had expected but also gave a direct lie to his prophesy by framing a democratic Constitution through the agency of the Constituent Assembly formed on the achievement of independence on 15 August 1947.

We shall briefly scan the Constitution to unravel the covenant and the basis of communal unity and integrity it envisages, making provision for the minorities referred to by Professor Park.

The term "minority" is not defined in it. Nor is there an accepted and authoritative definition that can be applied to the case of India. We have seen that all the minorities in Europe have been spoken of as ethnic or even racial minorities and that very frequently they are actually named so. So, too, discussion relating to minorities in the New World proceed by naming the actual minorities, whether native, immigrant, racial or ethnic. In the Constitution of India no group is mentioned by name as a minority.

\* Reinhold Niebuhr, *Nations and Empires*, p. 262.

<sup>1</sup> *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1939, pp. 1-25.

But the term minority came to be used long before independence. In the famous Nehru Report, the Report that was made to the National Congress and the people of India by Motilal Nehru, the following proposal relates to the Fundamental Rights<sup>2</sup>: "Adequate provision shall be made by the State for imparting public instruction in primary schools to the children of members of minorities through the medium of their own language and in such script as is in vogue among them." The context makes it quite plain to any Indian, who has followed the question of transfer of power from the British to the Indians since 1930, that the group meant as minority was, the whole of the Muslim group which formed part of India before partition, and that the provision was meant to allay the fears of Muslims that their language and script, which before then had been known to be Urdu in Persian lettering, shall be used to teach Muslim children at the primary stage. And, in the Constituent Assembly Debates over and over again minority *par excellence* connotes the "remnant" Muslim residents of India (Bharat).

The special rights guaranteed and provisions made are, however, meant for "sections of society", which, though not designated as minorities, are in essence to be treated as such, i.e., as requiring special provisions and protection. Minorities like the Muslims are but a special kind of such "sections of society" or are covered by the expression "any section of the citizens" of Article 29. It is desirable, therefore, to begin with a brief statement of the special provisions made and rights guaranteed in the Constitution of India. We shall leave out the special provisions for the Anglo-Indians and the Scheduled Castes and Tribes.

Articles 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 318, 350, 350A and 350B give us the whole conspectus of special provisions and rights, which Indian Constitution lays down and may be taken to guarantee their enjoyment by sections of the people, who either in the linguistic or religious domain, happen to be a numerically small group and likely to suffer in respect of language, practice of religion, practice and preservation of one or both of them, or in respect of larger complex of beliefs and practices known as culture.

At the outset it must be pointed out that the Draft Constitution<sup>3</sup> put up before the Constituent Assembly on 21 February 1948, had in its Part 14, headed "Special Provisions Relating to Minorities", ten Articles, the last of which related to the Commission to be appointed "to investigate the conditions of socially and educationally backward classes and the difficulties under which they labour and to make recommendations as to the steps that should be taken to remove them and to improve their condition. . . ." The first Article of the Part, (292), reserving seats for the minorities, began with "the Muslim community and Scheduled Castes" put together, for whom seats in the House of the People, afterwards and currently known as the

<sup>2</sup> As quoted by Z. H. Lari in the Constituent Assembly, See *Debates*, 7, 2, 0911. Itakes mine.

<sup>3</sup> Amos J. Peaslee, *Constitution of Nations*, Vol. III, (1950), pp. 649-742 (p. 726).

Loka Sabha, were to be reserved. The reservation for the Indian Christian Community, figuring third in the Article, was restricted, being available only in the States of Madras and Bombay. So late as May 1949, the Advisory Committee on Minorities was thinking and drafting in terms of these reservations, which were then quite appropriately distinguished as "political safeguards for minorities"; and Sardar Patel as the Chairman of that Committee introduced a proposal for the modification of the original report at the session of the Constituent Assembly on 25 May 1949.<sup>4</sup> The modification was really a negation of the earlier report, the Report of May deleting all reservation of seats to Muslims or to Indian Christians or to Sikhs. They are, however, like the Scheduled Castes, referred to as minorities.

One important feature of this change of temper and atmosphere, even more significant than the deletion of the reservation of seats for Muslims, Sikhs and Indian Christians, needs to be emphasized in the present context. And that is the dropping off of Article 299 of the Draft Constitution which formed part of the XIV Part. It ran:

(1) There shall be a Special Officer for minorities for the Union who shall be appointed by the President and a Special Officer for minorities for each State for the time being specified in Part I of the First Schedule who shall be appointed by the Governor of the State.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Special officer for the Union to investigate all matters relating to the safeguards provided for minorities under this Constitution in connection with the affairs of the Union and to report to the President upon the working of the safeguard at such intervals as the President may direct, and the President shall cause all such reports to be laid before Parliament.

(3) It shall be the duty of the Special Officer for a State so specified to investigate all matters relating to the safeguards provided for minorities under this Constitution in connection with the affairs of the State and to report to the Governor of the State upon the working of the safeguards at such intervals as the Governor may direct and the Governor shall cause all such reports to be laid before the Legislature of the State.

It is significant that the remnants of this Union special officer and of the State special officers are the two special officers, one for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the other for linguistic minorities enjoined in Articles 338 and 350B.

This change most emphatically repudiates the possibility of the recognition of any "minorities", in the technical sense and international content, within the Union known as India (Bharat). On the other hand, the complex of Fundamental Rights and the solemn declaration of the Directive Principles of State Policy guarantee certain rights and, make certain provi-

<sup>4</sup> *Constituent Assembly Debates* 7, 2, pp. 269-72

sions to accommodate the situation of certain sections of the people of the Union and to facilitate both non-discrimination on grounds of race, religion or language, and the conservation of their culture, the Indian culture as a whole being declared to be "composite" in Article 351. All in all, the Articles mentioned above in combination with Articles 44 and 45, clearly establish that the framers of the Constitution envisaged integration as the process and the state among and of the Indian peoples of Bharat, whether Christian Indians, Hindu Indians or Muslim Indians or other Indians.

Article 16 of the complex of Fundamental Rights secures all citizens of India against discrimination, "on grounds, among others, only of religion, race, caste and descent in the matter of employment or office under the State". It is in line with anti-discriminatory provisions of the international formula for standard minority rights. Article 19 guarantees the seven freedoms to all citizens. Article 25 guarantees, "subject to public order, morality and health", "freedom of conscience" to all persons and confers the right freely to profess, practise and propagate their religion. It is to be noted that this freedom about practice and propagation of religion is not restricted to the citizens but is available to all.

Article 26 further extends and specifies this freedom of religion. It reads:

Subject to public order, morality and health, every religious denomination or any section thereof shall have the right—(a) to establish and maintain institutions for religious and charitable purposes; (b) to manage its own affairs in matters of religion; (c) to own and acquire moveable and immoveable property; and (d) to administer such property in accordance with law.

Thus full autonomy, subject of course to the usual triad, viz., public order, morality, and health, and to the laws regarding property, public and private, and its management, is guaranteed to all sects and denominations, to all groups based on religion. Article 27 extends this freedom of religion, its practice and the management of its institutions by protecting all citizens against payment of taxes, if any, the State may like to levy for being "specifically appropriated in payment of expenses for the promotion or maintenance of any particular religious denomination".

Still further extension of freedom in religious matters is provided by Article 28, specifically prohibiting all imparting of religious education "in any educational institution wholly maintained out of State funds" which is primarily designed to secure the secular character of the State. Yet two of its clauses have the desired effect of extending freedom for all citizens and groups of citizens in the matter of religion. Clause 2 exempts from the operation of Clause 1, prohibiting all imparting of religious education, by legalizing such imparting in educational institutions which have been "es-

established under any endowment or trust which requires that religious instruction shall be imparted" in them. Clause 3 secures freedom to all citizens and their wards from attendance at any imparting of religious education or at "any religious worship that may be conducted" in "any educational institution recognized by the State or receiving aid out of State funds", and render the freedom completely effective as the Clause includes "any premises attached to" such an educational institution in the same category as a part and parcel of the institution.

The main positive-rights-securing Article, as far as any minority, or in fact any group, within the national State is concerned, is the 29th which may be transcribed here as it is:

(1) *Any section of the citizens\** residing in the territory of India or any part thereof having a distinct language, script or culture of its own shall have the right to conserve the same.

(2) No citizen shall be denied admission into any educational institution maintained by the State or receiving aid out of State funds on grounds only of religion, race, caste, language or any of them.

The Fundamental Rights guaranteed under Articles 25 to 28 are together headed as Right to Freedom of Religion, and those under the two Articles, 29 and 30, as Cultural and Educational Rights. In none of the first group of Articles is there the term minority, nor do their marginalia have it. The marginalia of the second set of Articles, however, speak of "minorities", though in the Article itself the expression used is "section of the citizens" to denote the category.

It would be instructive to know how these provisions came to be in the Constitution, i.e., the discussion if any that took place in the Constituent Assembly. For we know that frantic efforts were made and wild schemes were proposed to stave off the breaking of the "plural society"<sup>5</sup> of British India into the present two nation-states of Pakistan and India (Bharat). We have to presume that the remnant Muslim component of India (Bharat) rejected the plea of their co-religionists who formed the nation-state of Pakistan that Muslims were a separate nation, and acknowledged themselves as one component of the nation-state, India (Bharat), and that the framers of the Constitution, in spite of the consistent, persistent and vociferous demonstration to the contrary made by most of the Muslim members of the Constituent Assembly who spoke in the debate, assumed so.

Dr B. R. Ambedkar, moving the adoption of the Draft Constitution on 4 November 1948, i.e., about 15 months after the formation of the nation-state of India, championed the cause of "the safeguards it provides for minorities" as they were criticized. His speech is full of lurid portrayal of

\* Italics mine.

<sup>5</sup> Rupert Emerson, *From Empire to Nation*, op. cit., pp. 343-49.

the possible wrongs to minorities, unappreciative of their lack of moral rights under the then current political conditions, and in its reliance on the utterances of such European personalities as Lord Carson, ignored the history of the treatment and behaviour of European minorities during the previous 40 years. I therefore shall quote relevant parts of it to appraise the readers fully as to the climate under which the Constituent Assembly finally adopted the particular Articles of the Constitution of 1950; some of the more particularly relevant ones I have mentioned at the beginning of this chapter.

Dr Ambedkar said :<sup>a</sup>

In this country both the minorities and the majorities have followed a wrong path. *It is wrong for the majority to deny the existence of minorities. It is equally wrong for the minorities to perpetuate themselves.* A solution must be found which will serve a double purpose. *It must recognize the existence of the minorities to start with. It must also be such that it will enable majorities and minorities to merge some day into one.* The solution proposed by the Constituent Assembly is to be welcomed because it is a solution which serves this twofold purpose. To diehards who have developed a kind of fanaticism against minority protection, I would like to say two things. *One is that minorities are an explosive force which, if it erupts, can blow up the whole fabric of the State.* The history of Europe bears ample and appalling testimony to this fact. The other is that the minorities in India have agreed to place their existence in the hands of the majority. In the history of negotiations for preventing the partition of Ireland, Redmond said to Carson "ask for any safeguard you like for the Protestant minority but let us have a United Ireland". *Carson's reply was "Damn your safeguards, we don't want to be ruled by you". No minority has taken this stand. They have loyally accepted the rule of the majority which is basically a communal majority and not a political majority [2]. It is for the majority to realize its duty not to discriminate against minorities.* Whether the minorities will continue or will vanish must depend upon this habit of the majority. *The moment the majority loses the habit of discrimination against the minority, the minorities can have no ground to exist. They will vanish.*

Those of my readers who have followed my text so far or those who have pondered over one or the other of the half-a-dozen important books on minority-question will appreciate that the last portion of Dr Ambedkar's speech was a mere wish-fulfilment and a debating flourish without any substance. For first of all any vested social interest tends to perpetuate itself and in that endeavour it can and does continue to subsist for much longer time after the specific need for its exercise has ceased. And minority

<sup>a</sup> *Constituent Assembly Debates*, Vol. 7, I, p. 39. Italics mine.



interest is a group interest thoroughly ramified into the structure and function of the group and institutionalized ! Secondly as Professor Hans J. Morgenthau,<sup>7</sup> a profound student of Politics and the author of a very successful book, which during the 15 years from its first publication in 1948 has run into 19 reprintings, observes: "no political, religious, economic or regional group has been able to withstand for long the temptation to advance its claims by violent means if it thought it could do so without too great a risk".

The members of the Assembly,<sup>8</sup> to judge by their speeches, may be said to have refused to be stampeded into panicky action. Seth Govind Das, the champion of Hindi and of "Vaude Mataram" as the national anthem; said:

We do not want to place any minority, whether Muslim or other, under any disabilities. But, certainly we are not prepared to appease those who put the two-nation theory before us. I want to make it clear that only one culture can exist in the country.

Krishna Chandra Sharma went to the root of the matter and observed:

As I said, this country needs unity. The object is a united nation. Much has been said about the rights of minorities. I do not think our minorities are minorities in the real sense of the term or the classes or groups accepted by the League of Nations. We all belong to the same race . . . thus I do not understand the meaning of giving these special privileges in Chapter XIV [relating to minorities]. It creates statutory minorities and to say that the thing will last for ten years only is to forget the lesson of the past . . .

The trend of Muslim opinion can be judged from the additional demands made by some Muslim members, Begum Aizaz Rasul being one of them, for not only specific guarantee against change of Muslim personal law but also for statutory representation in the Services. One of them, Z. H. Lari wanted to evaluate the proposed safeguards contained in the Draft Constitution by the application of the test "*how far the provisions ensure justice if not generosity for the minorities and lastly, how far they ensure the independent development of the various national elements in the country*".<sup>9</sup>

On the other hand some declined to have the reservation of seats in the Legislature and desired it to be deleted. L. Krishnaswami Bharathi's observation on the aspect may be quoted here as it cuts the basis for the usual expression used by Muslim members to denote non-Hindu citizens

<sup>7</sup> *Politics Among Nations*, p. 507.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 223-4, 231.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 298. Italics mine.

of the country. It runs: <sup>10</sup>

*If some members of minority community now do not want reservation, I may not give all the credit to them as they are only making a virtue of necessity—this great Christian community have never asked for special considerations. They have all along been of the view that special electorates are no good and after all we must all live together and I am glad the Parsi community also had not wanted this special representation.*

Later, the situation changed so that the reservation of seats, which was guaranteed to "Muslims", "Scheduled Castes" and "Indian Christians", came to be recommended in the resolution of the Minorities Committee in May 1949 only for the Scheduled Castes.<sup>11</sup> Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, as the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Minorities, Fundamental Rights, etc. in his report presented to the President of the Constituent Assembly on the 11 May 1949 recommending the amendment of Part (Chapter XIV) of the Draft Constitution, relevant observations made during its discussion in 1948 from which are given above, wrote:

*Conditions have, however, vastly changed since August 1947 and the Committee are satisfied that the minorities themselves feel that in their own interests, no less than in the interests of the country as a whole, the statutory reservation of seats for religious minorities should be abolished.*

Some Muslim members moved amendments designed to secure Muslim representation *qua* Muslim but they were rejected. And the Constitution of India emerged, only with certain reservations for Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes and Anglo-Indians, and those, too, for a specific period which may be prolonged if necessary. Syed Muhammad Saadulla, who was for some time the Chief Minister of Assam before Independence, intervening in the debate stated that "all the Muslim members of my party in the Assam legislature gave the unanimous mandate of claiming reservation for the Muslims".<sup>12</sup>

Frank Anthony, the accredited leader and representative of the Anglo-Indian community, struck a different note, which, because of its historic value and frank sincerity in testifying to the reasonableness of the majority community, deserves to be read and pondered over in these days, when all sorts of charges are hinted at the majority community and many types of special demands are made on the Government of the country. He said:<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 366, Italics mine.

<sup>11</sup> *India, Constituent Assembly Debates*, Vol. 8, pp. 270-1, 310-12, 329. Italics mine.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 303.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 327-29, May 26, 1949, Italics mine.

From some speeches in this House, the impression might have been gathered that the Advisory Committee was animated by motives of wresting from the minorities what the minorities wanted or thought was necessary. I am here to refute that suggestion. There were many people who argued with unerring logic, who argued with even an implacable sense of reasonableness that the requests put forward by the minorities should not be accepted, because on the basis of logic, on the basis even of reasonableness, *on the basis of national integration, many of the requests put forward by the minorities were not tenable* . . . Sir, there is a feeling, particularly among journalists from other countries, that today the minorities in India are being oppressed, that minority representatives either do not, in fact, represent the minorities or they are petrified by a sense of fear and regimentation and do not speak of or express that fear which is in their hearts. I have never suffered from any sense of fear . . . May I say this that minority representatives today are not stooges of any particular party? . . . And may I say this, that in our march towards the goal—it is still a goal—*the minorities must be in the vanguard. Any minority which thinks that it can flourish on sectarianism is asking for ruin and death.*

Colonel B. Z. Haidi and Tajmal Husain were the two principal Muslim members of the Assembly who rose to oppose the Muslim demand for reservation. Tajmal Husain's<sup>14</sup> argument was the straighter of the two but it was based on the communal stand. He proclaimed that there were two sections or communities among the Muslims, the Shias and the Sunnis and that he was the only representative of the Shias in the Assembly. Quoting the resolutions passed by the All-India Shia Conference at its session at Muzaffarnagar on 31 December 1948, he stoutly opposed all reservation as anti-national. The Presidential Address by Sultan Ahmed speaking of reservation as "this speck of separatism" contained this cardinal and plainly stated truth:

Other minorities will also be encouraged to demand it, and thus, far from adding and aiding unity, it will only serve to promote separatism and create sectional strife, leading to untold religious, social and political complications. *Reservation carries with it as a corollary the maintenance of a communal political organisation and this must be avoided at all costs.*

Zaidi's arguments read rather specious and too personally dependent on Sardar Patel's goodwill. He blandly stated that except "a few friends from the South" the representatives of the Muslims "have given proof as never before of a sane, sound, balanced, patriotic outlook". Making a debating

<sup>14</sup> *Constituent Assembly Debates*, Vol. 8, pp. 333-38, 346-49. Italics mine.

point rather than advancing a sound argument he spoke of Sardar Patel and the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as the "only minority" in the country, he asked his co-religionists to join it and to strengthen their hands and make safe the destiny of themselves and of the country.

The special provisions made for "sections of the people" by the Constituent Assembly were intended to be short-lived, meant only for a time to enable them to adjust themselves to the new situation of a characteristic nation-state, as the specific duration of some of them must convince the reader. Readers will like to know what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the powerful source and magic inspirer of active toleration, had to say about it and which, I think, is all that need be transcribed here on the subject.

Nehru observed<sup>1</sup> on 26 May 1949: 'Where you are up against a full blooded democracy, if you seek to give safeguards to a minority, and a relatively small minority, you isolate it. Maybe you protect it to a slight extent, but at what cost? At the cost of isolating it and keeping it away from the main current in which the majority is going—I am talking on the political plane of course—at the cost of forfeiting of *that inner sympathy and fellow feeling with the majority*. Now, of course, in a democracy, in the long run or in the short run, *it is the will of the majority that will prevail*. Even if you are limited by various articles in the Constitution to protect the individual or the group, nevertheless, in the very nature of things, *in a democracy the will of the majority will ultimately prevail*. It is a bad thing for *any small group or minority to make it appear to the world and to the majority that 'we wish to keep apart from you, that we do not trust you, that we look to ourselves and that therefore we want safeguards and other things*.' The result is that they may get one anna in the rupee [one sixteenth part] of protection at the cost of the remaining 15 annas [15 parts]. This is not good enough looked at from the point of view of the majority either. It is all very well for the majority to feel that they are strong in numbers and in other ways and therefore they can afford to ride rough-shod over the wishes of the minority. If the majority feels that way, it is not only exceedingly mistaken, but it has not learnt any lesson from history, because however big the majority, *if injustice is done to minorities, it rankles and it is a running sore* and the majority ultimately suffers from it. So, *ultimately the only way to proceed about it—whether from the point of view of the minority or from the point of view of majority—is to remove every barrier which separates them in the political domain so that they may develop and we may all work together . . .*

'Let us be clear in our own minds over this question, that in order to proceed further *we have, each one of us whether we belong to the majority or to a minority, to try to function in a way to gain the goodwill of the other group or individual.*'

<sup>1</sup> Constituent Assembly Debates, 8, pp. 330-32. Italics mine.

This is as far as the political plane is concerned. Passing on to the cultural plane—the mixed plane of politico-cultural features, that is of law, is touched upon in one of the chapters—I shall begin with Nehru's views which he pronounced at the session of the Constituent Assembly held on 8 November 1948 speaking on the Objectives Resolution.

Said Pauditji: <sup>16</sup> "May I say one word again about certain tendencies in the country which still think in terms of separatist existence or separate privileges and the like? This very Objectives Resolution sets out *adequate safeguards to be provided for minorities for tribal areas, depressed classes*. Of course, that must be done, and it is the duty and responsibility of the majority to see that this is done and to see that they win over all minorities which may suffer from fear. It is right and important that we should raise the level of the backward groups in India and bring them up to the level of the rest. *But it is not right that in trying to do this we create further barriers, or even keep on existing barriers because the ultimate objective is not separatism but building up an organic nation, not necessarily a uniform nation because we have a varied culture, and in this country ways of living differ in various parts of the country, habits differ and cultural traditions differ*. I have no grievance against that. *Ultimately in the modern world there is a strong tendency for the prevailing culture to influence others. That may be a natural influence. But I think the glory of India has been the way in which it has managed to keep two things going at the same time, that is, its infinite variety and at the same time its unity in that variety*. Both have to be kept, because if we have only variety, then that means separatism and going to pieces. . . . *I do not think it will be a right thing to go the way this country has gone in the past by creating barriers and by calling for protection. As a matter of fact nothing can protect such a minority or a group less than a barrier which separates it from the majority. It makes it a permanently isolated group and it prevents it from any tendency to bring it closer to the other groups in the country.*"

The Constitution of India came to be framed after the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the U.N. This Declaration does not mention minority groups, the Bill of Rights pertaining only to individuals. An earlier chapter has given a brief account of the minority problems and their handling by the League of Nations. The Constitution of the U.S.S.R., treating a number of ethnic groups as so many Republics joining in the Federation, had already pointed the way to one approach to the position of minority groups. Almost immediately before the Constitution of India was framed the Yugoslavian Constitution accommodated the national minorities of the Yugoslav State after the pattern of the U.S.S.R. We have seen how Yugoslavia has been taking the leading part in agitating and preparing for a packet of special rights for minorities, linguistic, religious, ethnic or even cultural, secured by the guarantee of the U.N. It is then in the fitness of

<sup>16</sup> *Constituent Assembly Debates*, 7, 1, p. 323. Italics mine.

things that I should enlighten the reader on some of the Constitutional provisions in the Yugoslavian Constitution designed to guarantee complete autonomy to the three or four localized ethno-national minorities that form the constituent members of the Yugoslav State in order that the reader may appreciate India's provisions laid down in the Constituent Assembly almost unanimously.

In Article 2 the component units forming the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia are mentioned. Article 3 describes the coat of arms of the State. Article 4 fully describes, giving relative measurements, the three-coloured flag of the State. Article 5 specifies "the principal town" of the State as Belgrade. The five Articles 9-13, comprised in Chapter III of the Constitution, lay down the Fundamental Rights, Article 13 being the only one to refer to minorities. It reads: "National minorities in FPRY enjoy the right to and protection of their own cultural development and the free use of their own language." Article 18 guarantees "private property and private initiative in the economy". The inheritance of private property is guaranteed and the right of inheritance is said "to be regulated by law", there being no reference to any personal law of the citizens. It must be remembered that according to an official publication<sup>17</sup> of the State, in 1963 out of the 1,91,77,000 citizens of Yugoslavia 9,73,000 or a little over 5 per cent were Muslims. Article 22 says: "The citizens of the FPRY are bound to comply with the Constitution laws."

Article 25 guarantees "freedom of conscience and freedom of religion" to all citizens. It further goes on:

"The Church is separate from the State. Religious communities whose teaching is not contrary to the Constitution are free in their religious affairs and in the performance of religious ceremonies. *Religious schools for the education of priests are free and are under the general supervision of the State. The abuse of the Church and of religion for political purposes and the existence of political organizations on a religious basis are forbidden. The State may extend material assistance to religious communities.*"<sup>18</sup>

In this connection of religious education, the topic of education in general has great significance; and the relevant Article 38 of the Yugoslavian Constitution reads: "... Schools are State-owned. The founding of private schools may be permitted only by law and their workers controlled by the State. Elementary education is compulsory and free. The school is separate from the Church."

Article 26 bearing on marriage and family, i.e., on subjects which are essentially and commonly the most cherished portions of the personal laws

<sup>17</sup> *Facts about Yugoslavia*, 1964. Robert J. Kerner, *Yugoslavia*, 1949.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* Italics mine.

of peoples and nations runs:

Matrimony and the family are under the protection of the State. *The State regulates by law the legal regulations of marriage and the family. Marriage is valid only if concluded before the competent state-organs.*<sup>19</sup> After the marriage, citizens may go through a religious wedding ceremony.

The minorities of Yugoslavia are mostly localized and the Constitutional provisions need not be more detailed than what they are, but in India linguistic minorities are varied and scattered over about the whole length and breadth of the country. Moreover each State within the Indian Union has a High Court for the dispensation of justice besides the Supreme Court of the Union as the superior court of justice for all the States. The Constitution of India having laid down in Article 343 that the *official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script* and the States having their own languages with their scripts, it was paramount to have additional provisions. Clause 2 of Article 343 retained English as the official language for 15 years, i.e., till 1965. English has, however, continued to be the associate official language since 1966 without any determination about the period of its continuance as such a language.

The additional provisions necessitated by Article 343(1) refer both to States and linguistic groups. In the present context we are concerned only with the provisions which pertain to linguistic groups. Article 345 is such that though it is worded in terms which make it appear as a State-oriented provision it is relevant to our topic in this chapter. It reads:

Subject to certain provisions, the Legislature of a State may adopt any one or more of the languages in use in the State or Hindi as the language or languages to be used for all or any of the official purposes of that State.

Speakers of Urdu, i.e., persons whose mother-tongue is Urdu, and they are almost all Muslims, and linguistic groups having another than the State language or languages as their mother-tongue, can be affected by any action taken by States under this Article. And the Constitution makes provision for such a contingency in Article 347. It reads:

On a demand being made in that behalf, the President may, if he is satisfied that a substantial proportion of the population of a State desire the use of any language spoken to be recognised by that State, direct that such a language shall also be officially recognised throughout the State or any part thereof for such purpose as he may specify.

<sup>19</sup> Kerner, *Yugoslavia*. Italics mine.

Of the two Articles 350 and 351 which form Chapter IV entitled "Special Directives", Article 350 is concerned with rights of persons of different linguistic groups. It runs: "Every person shall be entitled to submit a representation for the redress of any grievance to any officer or authority of the Union or a State in any of the languages used in the Union or in the State, as the case may be." Later, in 1956 by the Seventh Amendment, Article 350A and 350B were added. Article 350A reads:

It shall be the endeavour of every State or of every local authority within the State to provide adequate facilities for instruction in the mother-tongue at the primary stage of education to children belonging to linguistic minority groups: and the President may issue such directions to any State as he considers necessary or proper for securing the provision of such facilities.

Article 350B provides for a special officer for linguistic minorities and his periodic reports on the implementation and observance of the provisions of safeguards for linguistic minorities. It reads:

(1) There shall be a Special Officer for linguistic minorities to be appointed by the President.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Special Officer to investigate all matters relating to the safeguards provided for linguistic minorities under the Constitution and report to the President upon those matters at such intervals as the President may direct, and the President shall cause all such reports to be laid before each House of Parliament, and sent to the Governments of the States concerned

The President has asked the reports to be annual.

Article 120 and 210 between them provide for reasonable facilities for addressing the Union or State legislatures as the case may be in a legislator's mother-tongue or in the language that he knows provided he is not able to express himself adequately in Hindi or English.

Article 120(1) reads:

Notwithstanding anything in Part XVII, but subject to the provisions of article 348, business in Parliament shall be transacted in Hindi or in English: Provided that the Chairman of the Council of States or the speaker of the House of the People, or person acting as such, as the case may be, may permit any member who cannot adequately express himself in Hindi or in English to address the House in his mother-tongue.

And Article 210(1) applies the principle of Article 120(1) to States thus:



Notwithstanding anything in part XVII but subject to the provisions of article 348, business in the Legislature of a State shall be transacted in the official language or languages of the State or in Hindi or in English: Provided that the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly or the Chairman of the Legislative Council, or the person acting as such, as the case may be, may permit any member who cannot adequately express himself in any of the languages aforesaid to address the House in his mother-tongue.

Thus we find a complex of safeguards, for linguistic and religious sections of the Indian population. In the matter of culture, too, a section having a distinct culture has the right to preserve it under usual conditions. Considering the dispersed nature of such groups in India the provisions as compared with those of Yugoslavia are not only not inferior but also are more liberal in some respects. It is not without very adequate and strong reasons that such a renowned student of history and constitution as Professor Max Beloff,<sup>20</sup> pondering over the Rhodesian situation after the break-up of European Colonialism, has observed:

...and for the proper performance of even its negative functions the inclusion of a Bill of Rights and of Directive Principles of State Policy on the Indian model /which he informs us are traced back to Republican Spain via Eire/ would have been desirable, particularly such measures of "differentiation" as the "colour-bar" lie at the root of much of the African objection to the federal scheme.

The Constitution of India contains provisions which Professor Beloff would have liked Rhodesia to adopt in the interests of Rhodesian integration and which as our brief comparison with the Constitution of Yugoslavia makes out are more liberal than those of the Yugoslavian Constitution because the Indian people in their Constituent Assembly, in spite of discordant voices of some minorities, were inspired by the faith expressed so clearly and emotively in the Preamble which reads:

We, the People of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a Sovereign Democratic Republic and to secure to all its citizens: Justice, social, economic and political; Liberty of thought expression, belief, faith and worship, Equality of Status and of opportunity, and *to promote among them all Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation . . . . Give to ourselves this Constitution.\**

The Preamble recognizes only the unique individual and his dignity and

<sup>20</sup> *The Great Powers*, 1959, p. 91.

\* Italics mine.

never mentions "group" or even "class", when it speaks of equality of status and of opportunity. And beyond the individual it speaks only of the unity of the nation. The integration envisaged by the Preamble is of individual citizens to effect the unity of the nation. Thus psychological integration is the principal aim of the Constitution. Yet, as we have seen above, various groups, sections of the people and even minorities are thought of and have been guaranteed rights to bring to them and their constituents the reality of the professions of the Preamble.

To this purpose of completely fulfilling the avowal made in the Preamble some provisions calculated to foster unity of the nation through both an individual and group approach are laid down in the Constitution. The two most important articles are (1) Article 45: "The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of the Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years;" and (2) Article 41: "The State shall endeavour to secure for the citizens a uniform civil code throughout the territory of India." Another important provision, is about the official language, which being Hindi, is enjoined in Article 351 to be developed into the national language as a competent vehicle of "the composite culture of India". It is dealt with in the chapter on linguistic tensions. The two Articles 44 and 45 selected for mention above as the most important are a part of the 'Directive Principles of State Policy' and as such are more potent than others.

## CHAPTER

### 5

## INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE: THREE VIEWS (I)

There is nothing that divides civilized from semi-savage man than to be conscious of our forefathers as they really were, and bit by bit to reconstruct the mosaic of the long-forgotten past . . . Truth is the criterion of historical study; but its impelling motive is poetic.\*

G. M. TREVELYAN

SINCE R. G. BHANDARKAR gave us his *Peep into the Early History of India* in 1901, books on specific periods of Indian history and on particular monarchs and dynasties began to be published more or less in a steady stream. Yet the years 1935 and 1936 strike one as particularly significant in having given us the history not only of monarchs and culture separately but of one ethno-politico-religious group, the Muslims. We got M. Zahir-ud-Din Faruki's *Aurangzeb and His Times* in 1935, giving us what, in the words of Irfan M. Habib,<sup>1</sup> may be called the view of the Islamic school of historians. In 1936 S. M. Jaffar, in his *Mughal Empire from Bahar to Aurangzeb*, may be said to have added his quota to the historical justification and Muslim idealization of Aurangzeb. In 1938 appeared the long-delayed fourth volume of the *Cambridge History of India* dealing with the Mughal period of Indian history. Still more curious is the coincidence of the appearance in 1936 of Dr Tara Chand's thesis *Influence of Islam on Indian Culture*.

About 1938 was published the collection of papers entitled *The Cultural Heritage of India* in three volumes as a centenary homage to Ramakrishna Paramahansa (1834-86). S. M. Jaffar, taking umbrage at the fact of there being only one small "chapter" on Islamic culture in it, and taking his cue from Dr Tara Chand's book, published, in 1939, his Islamic school view of the nature of cultural scene in India during the Muslim period of her history, in the book *Some Cultural Aspects of Muslim Rule in India*. Jaffar was then in the N.W.F. Province. The second edition of the book

\* G. M. Trevelyan, *English Social History*, 1944, p. X.

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, 1960, p. 209.

in 1950 naturally came with enlargement and elaboration of the theme from Pakistan.

1935 was the year of the Government of India Act promulgating Provincial Autonomy and laying down a federal Constitution for India; and 1936 was the year which witnessed a new trend in the Muslim League.

In 1946, i.e., after the two-nations theory of the Muslim League and of Mr Jinnah had taken firm root among a large section of Muslims, in the year in which Dr Rajendra Prasad poured his heart's anguish in his book *India Divided*, there appeared at least two books written by two Muslims in India, both dealing with the culture of India, portraying it as a synthesis of at least two cultures, Hindu and Islamic. Both, of course, had in them some portions devoted to the political history of India. One of them, that by Professor Abid S. Husain of Aligarh University, was a work in three volumes written in Urdu. The other was by Professor Humayun Kabir, entitled *Our Heritage*, recording "some thoughts on the unity and continuity of Indian culture".

Professor Kabir's book went into second edition in 1947 and was reprinted in 1949. Its third edition, revised and enlarged with the addition of a "Post-script", was published, under the new title *The Indian Heritage*, in 1955. Professor Husain, perhaps taking his cue from Kabir, and compressing his material of the Urdu book "into much less than half of its volume", rendered it into English and published it as a book in 1956 under the title *The National Culture of India*. Its second and enlarged edition appeared in 1961. Professor Husain's enlargement and even revision of the first edition of his book to turn it into its second edition in 1959 is very much greater and much more significant than that carried out by Professor Kabir in the third edition of his book.

Yusuf Husain, a Doctor of Letters of Paris University and Professor of History in Osmania University of Hyderabad, gave us rather sketchy and very one-sided glimpses of his elaboration of the views of Tara Chand, Humayun Kabir and Abid Husain. He added some observations on education and on Urdu language and perfunctory remarks on the so-called social and economic conditions. Of course it is only Northern India that is India for Yusuf Husain in his book, *Glimpses of Medieval Indian Culture*, which he dedicated to Maulana Azad and published in 1957. I should point out that perhaps the first two chapters of his book were a part of his Doctorate thesis which he appears to have published in French in 1929 and that, in 1933, he contributed a paper to *Islamic Culture* on the influence of Islam on the cult of Bhakti in Mediaeval India. But he has given no indication of this in his book.

*A Social History of Islamic India* by Mohammad Yasin (1958), in its limited scope dealing as it does with India of the later Moghuls, i.e., from A.D. 1605 to 1748, harps on the theme of mutual tolerance, influence and even some assimilation of the Muslims and the Hindus of the time, though

very judiciously and sometimes even haltingly.

Recently three Pakistani intellectuals, holding responsible academic positions in American or Canadian Universities, one of them with the further help of the Rockefeller Foundation, brought out books with the help of well-known Anglo-American publishers.

Ishtaq Husain Qureshi, the author of *The Muslim Community of the Indo-Pakistani Sub-Continent* (610-1947), was before his adoption of Pakistan as his country, for some years Professor of History in Delhi University. In Pakistan, it appears, he took to political career for sometime; and after having been a member of Government for sometime, he acquired an academic position in Columbia University. It was under the aegis of that University and with the generous help of the Rockefeller Foundation that he carried out his work. His book forms part of a series, sponsored by Columbia University under an Editorial Board of which Qureshi is a member, and entitled "Publications in Near and Middle East Studies."

Hafeez Malik took a straighter course in naming his book *Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan*. It was published in 1963 by Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C.; and Hans Kohn, the author of the once well-known book *A History of Nationalism in the East* (1929), wrote a brief foreword to it.

Aziz Ahmad of Toronto University wrote, as his preface reveals, his *Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment* in 1961-62. But the book was published by Clarendon Press, Oxford, only in 1964. So his book is the last of the trio referred to above.

The point of view--I say the point and not points because though the titles of the books and their subject-matter are slightly different in all of them, yet a number of things in them and their authors' attitude towards them are common--in regard to the extent and nature of Indian political history, wherever it is dealt with, as also to the influence of Islam on India being salutary and dynamically creative, is almost identical in all of them.

The view of Indian history presented in these books might have been called Pakistani, if it was logically given, and then it would not have been necessary to object to the nomenclature. But as it is the view appears much more to be the view of "Islamic school of history", having adherents and proponents in India mostly amongst Muslims and sporadically among Hindus.

Mr Malik devotes nearly two-thirds of his book *Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan* to Indian history, nearly two-thirds of the portion treating directly history proper and the remaining one-third dealing with Muslim personages of later history and their involvement in historical events. This latter portion, headed "Religious Nationalism" and "Struggle for National Freedom", analyzes, describes, and evaluates the preachings and doings of Shah Waliullah (1703-1763 A.D.) of Delhi and Shahid Sayyid Ahmad Barelvi (1786-1831 A.D.) of Rae Bareilly.

Both these personages figure in Qureshi's and Ahmad's books; and the former in the academic writings of some Muslims in India. They figure in some of the larger books on Indian history though not in *The Cambridge History of India*, or in such briefer volumes as *The Cambridge Shorter History of India* by Allan, Haig and Dodwell published in 1934. However, they certainly are the heroes and hero-prototypes not only of Pakistani Muslims but also of Muslims in India.

I shall write about them in the correct context of political history. But here I must point out how one of them, Shah Waliullah, has found an honourable place in the Government-of-India-sponsored *History of Philosophy* under the Chief Editorship of India's ex-President, Dr S. Radhakrishnan, who was then (1952) her Ambassador at Moscow. In the second edition of the first volume of the work published in 1957, in a whole chapter, entitled "Growth of Islamic Thought in India", contributed by Dr Tara Chand and Mr S. Kamil Husain, a pleader from Ghosipur in Gorakhpur District (U.P.), Shah Waliullah (spelled there as Wali Ullah) receives full two and a half pageful of notice. Shahid Sayyid Ahmad Bareilvi, too, figures; but he is brought in along with Shah Waliullah, significantly in the chapter "Contemporary Indian Thought (B)" contributed by Dr K. A. Hakim, one-time Professor of Philosophy, Osmania University, Hyderabad.

Dr Hakim, naming Shahid Sayyid Ahmad Bareilvi as only Maulvi Saiyed Ahmed of Rea Bareilly, observes (p. 537):

The seed that was sown by him [Shah Waliullah] germinated in his own life-time, but his influence became even more widespread after his death. Within a century after him, his teachings bore fruit in the form of a vigorous movement led by Maulvi Saiyed Ahmed of Rae Bareilly and Maulvi Mohammed Ismail of Delhi. Saiyed Ahmed was a pupil of Shah Abdul Qadir, the eldest son of Shah Waliullah. *The object of the movement was to revive the spirit of Islam by creating a modern State on truly Islamic line.\**

The first two sentences in the above quotation make explicit what Dr Tara Chand and his Muslim associate imply when they observe (p. 506): "His [Waliullah's] sons and pupils handed down his teachings which exercised a great influence on the development of Muslim thought and life in the 19th century."

Both these personages, Shah Waliullah and Shahid Sayyid Ahmad Bareilvi, figure in the books of all the three Indian Muslim authors the contents of whose works traverse over the period in which they lived. They are: *Glimpses of Medieval Indian Culture* of Professor Yusuf Husain; *A Social History of Islamic India* of Dr Mohammad Yasin; and *The National Cul-*

\* Italics mine.

ture of India of Professor Abid Husain. The first two authors<sup>2</sup> speak of a third personage, Sirhindi. He is referred to as the "Mujaddid". So also do the contributors to the Government-sponsored *History of Philosophy I*.<sup>3</sup> But Abid Husain refrains from using the term, thus violates the general usage of the Muslims, and thereby unintentionally conceals a significant feature and an index of the Muslim mind.

The full designation of Ahmad Sirhindi is worthwhile noting because it reveals a significant feature of Muslim religious thought, closely similar to one characterizing Hinduism at least for more than eight centuries before the birth of Islam. It is "Mujaddid-i-Alf-i-Thani" as all the three Pakistani Muslim authors<sup>4</sup> have it. Dr Yasin, however, gives it as "Mujaddid Alf-i-Sani".<sup>5</sup> The Government-sponsored *History of Philosophy I*<sup>6</sup> has it both ways.

Dr Yasin informs us that the expression means "Regenerator of the second Millennium" and that it was claimed by Ahmad Sirhindi himself and was actually applied to him by the highest Islamic dignitary of the reign of Shahajahan, Sirhindi having himself lived in the reign of Jehangir, the father of Shahajahan. Of the three Pakistani authors, two, Qureshi and Ahmad, render the word "Mujaddid" or "renovator" and not "regenerator".

Dr Yasin has enlightened us on the Islamic theory of "Mahdis" and "Mujaddids". He says (p. 132) "God has promised to send a Mahdi (the comforter, paraclete or restorer) at the time of spiritual crisis in Islam", and points out in a footnote that the idea of restorer is common to other religions as well, mentioning the Hindu belief in the coming of Vishnu's Kalki incarnation, to substantiate his remark.<sup>7</sup> Though no fresh prophet to create a new "nation" or "state" is to be expected, Islam being the final form of religion, "to overhaul Islam and to restore it to its pristine purity, God will send 'Mujaddids' in the times of spiritual decay and religious crisis". Many predictions on this line are ascribed to Muhammad himself and nearly every century after the death of Muhammad there has been a "Mujaddid", all of whom are claimed by the Muslims as "regenerators" of Islam. The concept of "Mujaddid" is best particularized by pointing out that a person making a programme for the betterment of the Muslims "at the cost of Islamic principles" is not a "Mujaddid".<sup>8</sup>

Dr Yasin states (p. 147) that with the approach of the second millennium, i.e., at the end of the first millennium after Prophet Muhammad's death, "the

<sup>2</sup> Yusuf Husain, *op. cit.*, pp. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, Mohammad Yasin, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-67, 172.

<sup>3</sup> P. 511.

<sup>4</sup> Qureshi, pp. 77, 152-8. The designation is simplified into 'Mujaddid Alf Thani' by H. Malik, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-4, 294; A. Ahmad, *op. cit.*, pp. 184, 189.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 145-67.

<sup>6</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 503, 511.

<sup>7</sup> Yasin, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

<sup>8</sup> Yasin, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-6.

question of a regenerator of Islam in India greatly agitated the minds of the Muslim community. *Islam had undergone a change for the worse in Hindustan since its spread in this country*.<sup>9</sup> And "Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi", born in 1563, A.D. was the man. Ahmad Sirhindi's teaching consisted in asking Muslims to go back to Muhammad for guidance in the conduct of life and faith and, in particular, in rejecting as unIslamic the monistic Vedantic concept of unity of self and God, so fervently and critically enunciated by one of the greatest of the Sufis, Al'Arabi. As to the vast influence of Sirhindi in India, and outside India over a large part of the Islamic world, there does not appear to be any difference of opinion. But on the question whether his preaching and influence have been for the good of mankind or even of Muslims the writers divide themselves into two schools.

I. Qureshi and Hafeez Malik, both Pakistani Muslims, applaud Sirhindi for his courage, zeal, intelligence, and value his services, the latter adding a remark which is a historical truth without any valuation. He says (p. 55):

Shaikh Ahmad's influence on posterity has been great indeed. His was truly the call "back to Muhammad" with far-reaching consequences in both religious and political terms. *His teaching . . . opposed secularization of Muslim rule in India and set in motion those forces for the recreation of the pre-Akbar political system which triumphed during the reign of Jahangir's grandson, Emperor Aurangzeb.*\*

The frankness and candour of H. Malik are remarkable except for his withholding of a valuational judgment on the asserted and ascertained effect of the life and teaching of Mujaddid Sayyid Ahmad Sirhindi.

I. Qureshi is apparently more frank and forthright in his Pakistani or Islamic appraisal of the Indian scene in the reign of Akbar and his three successors. He asserts (pp. 158-9) that without the change brought about "in public [Muslims of India?] sentiment" by the work of Ahmad Sirhindi "both Shah Jahan and Almgir I"—mark Qureshi's insistence and persistence in the use of this name in place of Aurangzeb by which name the monarch is known to most students of Indian history—"could not have thrived". In appraising Sirhindi's criticism of Sufi-monism and his reconstruction of it, Qureshi enthusiastically lauds his "rejection of monism" as "the great need of the age" and bases Sirhindi's claim to the title of the "Mujaddid" of the age, "in the perspective of history" (p. 157). Evidently for Qureshi Indian history of the age is only the history of the Muslim monarchs and the Muslim population of India, however small it might have been.

On the other hand, Qureshi<sup>10</sup> keeps almost silent about Sirhindi's in-

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* Italics mine.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 156.



fluence on the 19th century Indian Muslims of importance, remarking only casually that "in later times Iqbal was a strong critic of monism". Malik<sup>11</sup> has, however, obliged us by directly drawing our attention to Iqbal, whom he designates as "*the poet-philosopher of Pakistan*", and tells us that Iqbal "extols the Shaikh's dignity" and expresses "his gratitude for the services rendered to the Moslems". He adds that Iqbal "calls him [Sirhindi] *the spiritual guardian of the Moslem nation in India and declares it was God Almighty Himself who alerted the Shaikh to the dangers inherent in Akbar's religious and political innovations*".\*

Aziz Ahmad<sup>12</sup> provides us with not only Sirhindi's religio-philosophical thought on which Qureshi dilates at length but also his views on Hinduism and Hindu practices. "Shaikh Ahmad" regarded *Islam and Hinduism* which later he designated as *Kufr* to be "*opposite, antithetical and therefore mutually exclusive*" and asserted that "*the two opposites cannot integrate; one can thrive only at the expense of the other*". Hinduism was not only antithetical to, but also the arch-enemy of Islam. Consequently he wanted his co-religionists to realize that "*the honour and security of Islam is dependent upon the humiliation of the unbelievers and their faith*". He regarded Jizya "*not as the poll-tax for the protection 'dhimmis', but as an institution symbolizing their humiliation*". In appraising Sirhindi's services to Islam in general and Indian Islam in particular, Ahmad is more laudatory and frank than either Qureshi or Malik. I have quoted above Malik's view. Qureshi<sup>13</sup> remarks only in a general way: "Leading thinkers of orthodox Islam in the sub-continent have unanimously accepted him as such [i.e., as the Mujaddid-i-alf-i-thani]". Ahmad<sup>14</sup> not only values Sirhindi's, thought as "perhaps the most distinct contribution of Indian Islam to the religio-mystical thought of Islam in general" but is convinced that Sirhindi's success in India made *Indian Islam "rigid and conservative"*.\* Accordingly he regards Sirhindi as "the pioneer" of Modern Indo-Pakistani Islam which is "*isolationist, self-confident, conservative, deeply conscious of the need of a reformation but distrustful of innovations, accepting speculation in theory but dreading in practice, and insular in its contact with other civilizations*".\* Aziz Ahmad explains this phenomenon by the fact that intellectual leaders of Muslim India in modern times, i.e., the 19th and the 20th centuries, like Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the progenitor of Aligarh Muslim University, Iqbal the second or third greatest Urdu poet and the spiritual father of Pakistan, and Abul Kalam Azad, the late Education Minister of the Government of India, an ex-President of the Congress and

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 54. Italics mine.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 185-7. Italics mine.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 152.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 189. Italics mine.

\* Italics mine.

the great Muslim theological thinker, had "at one time or other" been influenced by Sirhindi's writings.

Dr Tara Chand and his Muslim associate in their contribution to the Government-sponsored *History of Philosophy, I*, guardedly state the correct appraisal that historians would frankly and pronouncedly proclaim about Sirhindi's anti-integrative approach and movement. They observe (p. 511) that he "unfortunately accentuated the narrowness and bigotry which the spread of Sufi ways and teachings [they should have added 'among Muslims'] had combated and overcome". The last verb, as will be seen from this book, grossly exaggerates the actuality.

Dr Mohammad Yasin<sup>15</sup> has taken an almost wholly rational and critical view of the Mujaddid's teaching and activity, devoting a whole chapter to them. He blames Sirhindi for the later "mental serfdom of the disciple (*murid*) to the *pirs* (spiritual guides) who misled the people" and asserts that after all "Sufism slipped back to its Pantheistic Indian groove" so that Sirhindi succeeded in whipping up "the Sufi zeal without going back to Muhammad". As regards the consequences of Sirhindi's teaching and activity for the Indian society, Dr Yasin says:<sup>16</sup>

But all the same he left to posterity the legacy of communal hatred and religious bitterness and fanaticism. *Communal riots of Shias and Sunnis, and later on Hindu-Muslim riots became frequent with the tightening grip of reaction and intolerance preached by the Mujaddid.\**

At this stage it is necessary to take notice of certain assertions—I cannot call them more than that as the so-called evidence in favour of them are certain qualified statements of an early European writer on Hinduism—made by Dr Tara Chand in his book *Influence of Islam on Indian Culture*. I should not have taken the trouble to do so but for two facts. First, Dr Tara Chand's assertions have been taken as gospel truth and quoted by almost all the half-a-dozen Muslim writers referred to in this chapter, who have written on history and/or culture of India, whether they are Pakistani or Indian. And not infrequently have they unwittingly added a little unsupported quota of their own, one of the first ones to do so being Professor Humayun Kabir. The assertions are about the influence of Islamic thought on the philosophy of Shankaracharya and on the devotional approach of the philosophy of Ramanuja as well as on the "matha" or monastic organization and the importance of the monastic head or "guru" (preceptor).<sup>17</sup>

Second, in the *History of Philosophy I*, Dr Tara Chand and his Muslim

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 165.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 164, *Italics mine*.

\* *Italics mine*.

<sup>17</sup> Dr Tara Chand, *op. cit.*, 14, 55, 105-9, 111, 115-124, 128-9.

associate in 1952 in an ambiguous statement imply the same influence of Islamic Sufis on Shankaracharya and Ramanujacharya. They observe (p. 508):

On the speculative side the Muslim mystics in India were followers of two schools—the extreme pantheists or the moderate pantheists, Wajudiah and Shuhudiah. The first believed that all is God and the latter that All is from God. The two schools are paralleled in Hinduism by the Advaita schools of Samkara and the Visistadvaita of Ramanuja.

The hesitant remark of Dr Tara Chand regarding probable influence on Shankaracharya of Islamic thought was turned into a flat and unqualified assertion of positive influence by Humayun Kabir,<sup>18</sup> in 1946, thus:

Few suspect any external influence on Vedanta of Sankara and yet there are reasons to suppose that he was influenced by the impact of Islam on the prevalent modes of thought. Since the beginning of recorded history, all new movements in Hindu thought . . . had their origin in northern India. *Suddenly about the beginning of the eighth century, there is a revolutionary change. The leadership of Indian thought and life is transferred to the south . . .* It is in the south that Vaishnavism and Saivism rise and flourish.

Stating that historians have been puzzled by this phenomenon Kabir finds “a clue to the solution of the *mystery* if we connect it with the advent of Islam in the south about the middle of the 7th century” [? so early]. He then mentions a tradition which asserts that Shankaracharya was born in a place which lay in a small principality whose king had accepted Islam. Finally Humayun Kabir asks his readers: “Is it fanciful to find in Sankara’s fervour and zeal traces of the influence of the revolutionary zeal of Islam?” Then waxing eloquent on Shankaracharya’s thought and activity, Kabir discovers in Shankara’s apparently contradictory “emphasis on action” both in preaching and in practice his reason for the latter “in the fact that Islam had already made itself felt as a force in the country of Sankara’s birth”, and concludes that the emphasis on action combined with “*a passionate insistence upon the unity of the Brahman reveals a source of affinity with Islam*”.

Aligarh Professor Abid Husain, admirer and protagonist of “the way of Gandhi and Nehru” and almost the first Muslim to propound and explain “the national culture of India”, writing about the same time as, or a little later than Kabir, goes a step or two further, elaborating the arguments on

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 81-7. Italics mine.

the way. Husain,<sup>19</sup> remarking that Northern India in the period A.D. 700 to A.D. 1000 was sterile of thought and literature [?] and convulsed with foreign invasions, finds South India saving "intellectual life from stagnation". The whole period remarkable for "movement and activity in religious thought", a perfectly correct opinion whose implications Husain has ignored, was replete with the compilation and the teaching of the *Puranas*. Professor Husain further observes: "*The way of 'Advaita' shown by Shankaracharya and that of 'Bhakti' initiated by the Alvar poets appear to be new movements in the religious history of India.*" He looks upon both movements as revivals but seeks the reason for their arising in South India at the particular time they did, i.e. the 8th century. Rejecting the opinion of "some historians" that the influence of Nestorian Christianity in the South explains the phenomenon, he says: "But Dr Tara Chand in his valuable book 'The Influence of Islam on Indian Culture' *has proved that these movements were inspired by the impact of Islam.*" Finally Husain concludes: "The *Bhakti* movement, beginning with the mystic poets and culminating in the philosophy of Ramanuja, and the revival of Vedanta brought about by Shankaracharya were both to a great extent due to the general religious awakening caused by the impact of Islam."

In the hands of Pakistani Qureshi,<sup>20</sup> the incorrect, though somewhat qualified views of Dr Tara Chand becomes a potent link in the chain of Islamic influences and benefits, exercised and conferred upon Hinduism and Hindus in their own land.

To begin with the beginning, Qureshi starts with stating his broad and deep proposition that "the contact of Hinduism with Islam" showed its first effect in "the quickening of the heartbeat of religion", "*emotion beginning to play a dominant role*", and in "*God, from being impersonal and immanent or being not actively concerned with the everyday life of the individual*", being "*gradually transformed into a transcendent personal God*". The Tirumurai of the Saiva literature of the South begins "to show strong tendencies in this direction". Mentioning the parallel collected literature of Vaishnavas, without of course giving the date or dates of the production of the individual pieces of these collections, he remarks that it has "many parallel passages which would inspire any Muslim" and "*a richness of fervour which reminds one strongly of the Sufi poets of Islam*".\*

Ascribing the accomplishment of the task of dislodging Jainism and Buddhism, which "*the executions of the Jains and the Buddhists by the fanatical converts to Brahmanism from among the rulers*" had not achieved, to the Tamil hymnners of these collections in part and partly to scholastics like Shankaracharya, Qureshi dilates on Shankaracharya's work. *Inter alia* he is very much interested in pointing out that the quality of Hindu free

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 71-5. Italics mine.

<sup>20</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 26-33.

\* Italics mine.

and bold thinking of olden times deteriorated in the hands of Shankaracharya, and also in insisting that he made a compromise with the lower form of religio-philosophical view to get his system popularized, Qureshi characterizes Shankaracharya's work as an *attempt so divorced from the Brahmanical tradition that it went contrary to its very spirit*.<sup>21</sup> To account for this apparent contradiction and supposed simplification, Qureshi is not satisfied with the explanation that derives Shankaracharya's thought from the armoury of Buddhism but remarks that "the Islamic parallel comes so readily to the mind that it cannot be easily dismissed" as it is "not impossible that Shankara's astute mind could have discovered a potent danger from this quarter".

Qureshi then speaks of Ramanuja, "born in the eleventh century"—It should be noted that Qureshi discreetly passes over Shankaracharya's date, being too early for ready acceptance of Qureshi's questionable logic, though he mentions in a footnote the date of the Vaishnava collection of hymns as the 10th century, it being quite plausibly situated for his argument in favour of Islamic influence—and ascribes to him not only the self-surrender component of the Bhakti-cult but also of the "complete trust in the preceptor". He then triumphantly says: "This reminds one strongly of Islam" and adds his comment in Islamic Sufi terms for meditation and for "the stage of beatific vision". The term for this last phenomenon, which is the goal of one school of Muslims Sufis, is *Shuhud*. He adds further that the very "meaning of the term Islam" is "surrender to God" and that "*the emphasis upon complete faith in the preceptor also reminds one of the Islamic requirement of faith in the mission of the Prophet, or the Sufi insistence upon the acceptance of the authority of the Shaikh.*" \*

Not to leave anything out that is even remotely suggested in Dr Tara Chand's books as grist for the mill of his Islamic superiority complex, Qureshi then speaks of the Siddhars "who were strict monotheists" without, of course, any mention of their dates. Qureshi dilates on Siddhars' doctrines, stating that they did not believe in metempsychosis, nor in the scriptures, nor again in caste but only in one God, relying for guidance on "a supreme religious preceptor". He concludes, "They seem to have been so deeply influenced by Islam that they have occasionally borrowed even the Sufi imagery."

With all his glowing pride in the supposed influence of Islam on the great contribution of Kerala and Tamilnad to the corpus of Hinduism, both in its philosophical and religious aspects, Qureshi sees need to disarm criticism on the argumentative side by hedging and by disclaiming the

<sup>21</sup> Qureshi, *op. cit.*, p. 27. Italics mine.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>22</sup> Readers of Barth's book *Religions of India*, will find that their school (Siddhars'), if any, was conspicuous by absence in India, when Barth wrote his book in the eighteen seventies or eighties.

possibility of more concrete proof in the particular case.

Qureshi quotes the semi-anthropological official Fawcett's opinion expressed about 1870 regarding the likelihood of "Islam having been the cause of the new orientation in the Hindu thought of South India", and further states that he thought Shankara to have been influenced by Islam. And though only a page earlier he mentions Barth's opinion that "monotheistic concept and the idea of devotion were indigenous to India", evidently with suggestive approval, Qureshi repeats his statement of "the fact that the great religious movements took place in the South where the Muslims had settled in the early history of Islam". Finally, as if the views of the abovementioned writers were not absorbed in the formulation of Dr Tara Chand's own opinion or as if Dr Tara Chand had arrived at the same conclusion independently, Qureshi says: "Of the later writers Tara Chand has reached the same conclusions", though the actual quotation of Dr Tara Chand's view made by him goes further than the opinion of Barth and Fawcett.

Almost everything about Shankara is welcome to Qureshi as catch in his all-embracing web of Islamic influence; and he does not fail to use another traditional element in the life-story of this extraordinary individual. It should be remembered that he was neither the first nor the last of such superior geniuses that Hinduism and India produced though he may be acknowledged to be the greatest among them. Goraknath of the 11th or the 12th century is another, if Ramanuja is not one just before him. Tradition holds that Shankaracharya was an incarnation of Shiva appearing because the king of the country having been converted to Islam, Hindu Dharma had to be saved from the clutches of Islam. Shiva's incarnations are not an established tradition of the Puranas. Nevertheless Qureshi seeks support of this silly tale for his idea that Shankara's methodical philosophical and religious system was a response to the challenge of Islam.

Hafeez Malik, being concerned only with the history of nationalist movement among Muslims, has no reason to probe into the question of the influence of Islam on Hindu religious thought or practice. And, though Aziz Ahmad's subject-matter leads him very fully into the question, both because his approach is throughout much more scientific than that of any other of the more than half-a-dozen writers (except Dr Yasin) whom I have had the reason to evaluate and also because his view regarding the nature of the two communities, Hindus and Muslims, and their rapprochement is almost as separatist as that of Hafeez Malik,—a view which the present writer has been convinced for over 30 years, is the only correct one, having found support in actual facts from the days when the Muslims set their feet as invaders in India, and since the time when the scholar, Al Beruni wrote about their fundamentally opposed ways of thought and living in the eleventh century—he does not follow Dr Tara Chand's lead. Going to

the origin of the views of Dr Tara Chand, i.e., to Barth, he<sup>23</sup> even does not endorse Dr Tara Chand's slightly modified version of the situation as stated in *The History of Philosophy I*.<sup>24</sup>

Dr Tara Chand's version in the above reads:

It [the movement of religious thought] originated in the South and most of its great leaders belonged to the South. Their appearance at this period and in this region is a remarkable fact. It may be explained partly by the conditions of the state and society which then prevailed, and partly by the natural development of thought. But it has also to be remembered that from the earliest days of Islamic history, that is, the seventh century, Muslims had established contacts with the peoples of India on the southern coast, and had acquired opportunities of playing an important role in the life of these regions. Whether this coincidence had any influence upon religious developments cannot be established with absolute certainty, but there is much in the thought of the religious reformers of these times which appears to echo Islamic beliefs and practices.

Aziz Ahmad,<sup>25</sup> a Pakistani Muslim of respectable academic standing, writes about Dr Tara Chand's views:

Even Tara Chand, *a passionate advocate of the theory of composite growth of Hindu-Muslim Culture*, has to concede: "While the Hindu mind was primarily concerned with what is true, the Moslem was exercised over what is right. . . The Hindu felt no kinship with the Arab past which the Moslem hugged to his bosom. The Moslem did not feel at home in Vedic India. While consciousness of group developed, and the element of territoriality was prominent in both, the content of the two did not quite coincide and fuse".

This opinion was expressed by Dr Tara Chand writing in 1959 in Humayun Kabir's book, *Abul Kalam Azad*, and refers of course to the total process including the stage called "Hindustani Culture" by Dr Tara Chand, Professor Abid Husain and others of their way of thinking. It may be said that it does not forewear or even modify Dr Tara Chand's views about the supposed debt of Shankaracharya and Ramanujacharya and of the Tamil hymners and "Siddhars" to Islam in general and to Sufism in particular. Aziz Ahmad<sup>26</sup> approves of Yusuf Husain's suggestion of "possible influences of Ismaili mysticism on Ramanuja", pointing out that Ramanuja "*stands much closer to Islamic orthodoxy than to earlier Hindu religious*

<sup>23</sup> Aziz Ahmad, *op. cit.*

<sup>24</sup> P. 489.

<sup>25</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 76. Italics mine.

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 129-30. Italics mine.

*thinkers*" in recognizing the plurality of souls. He further draws attention to a parallelism between Ramanuja's view of Brahman as the sum total of individual souls and Al-Ghazzali's treatment of souls though the latter's view makes "souls as created even if they are not subject to space and time". The exaltation of the spiritual teacher "though ultimately traceable to Hindu origin, received a new significance under Muslim influence". He does not directly say anything about influence on Shankaracharya.

Aziz Ahmad's inclusion of Shankaracharya in his final summing up regarding suggested Islamic influence on the Acharyas is tame enough to indicate that, in the main, Shankaracharya, in his opinion, remained outside Islamic influence. He says: "All the essentials of the mystical thought of Shankaracharya and Ramanuja and of their successors are of purely Hindu origin. All that Islam and/or Christianity could have done was to offer an atmosphere of spiritual stimulus."

Aziz Ahmad, partially at least must have been restrained in the expression of his opinion about Islamic influence on Shankaracharya and Ramanujacharya by the fact that R. C. Zaehner, Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics in the University of Oxford, who, true to the designation he bears, has deeply studied both Hinduism and Islam, had published his "Jordan Lectures 1959" in the book *Hindu and Muslim Mysticism* in 1960. This highly original and stimulating book contains a whole chapter entitled "Vedanta in Muslim Dress" and another headed "Self-deification", both together putting forward in a clearly and closely reasoned argument the possibility of some of the fundamental tenets about the Absolute or God and the relation of individual souls to It and the condition of union or equality, to which these latter can attain, having been derived in Sufism from the Vedanta philosophy as developed and expounded by Shankaracharya.

It is more than surprising that though Aziz Ahmad takes Zaehner's views into account, of course rejecting them as a staunch Muslim of Pakistani mentality, Dr Tara Chand, a Hindu India, should reprint his thirty to forty years old wrong views on the relation between Hindu philosophy of Shankaracharya and Ramanujacharya without demur. How can one expect him under these circumstances to beat a retreat and propound the possibility of some of the early Muslim Sufis having been influenced by Shankaracharya's monism?

Aligarh Muslim University Professor Abid Husain can still less be expected to view the highly questionable opinions of Dr Tara Chand, in face of their pronouncement in a slightly exaggerated form by Pakistani authors, with greater circumspection and scientific attitude. But an Indian has a right to expect that even Aligarh Muslim University, and more so Professor Abid Husain, who, as already stated, the first Muslim to conceive of Indian National Culture as a unity, in a small brochure of 64 pages, intended to offer cultural food in tabloid form, as a part of the



general education programme, to such a large number of Muslims taking University education—Muslims who not only cannot be expected to read anything more on the subject written by Hindus but also are to be presumed to be amenable to the influences of Pakistani prejudiced writing on the subject—would have avoided all reference to the topic. One is sorely disappointed and deeply chagrined at seeing, instead, that the brochure *Indian Culture*, which disposes of the cultural history of the country of the first 3500 years in 22 pages and devotes 17 pages to the history of the recent 90 years (1857-1947), should, within the compass of the 22 pages, devote a whole paragraph to the questionable opinion which is likely to fan the pride of Muslims in India and hurt orthodox Hindus.

After mentioning Shankaracharya's theories of monism and "maya" and their rejection by Ramanujacharya in a paragraph of about 6 lines, Professor Husain<sup>27</sup> devotes the following paragraph of 12 lines to deal with the influence of Islam on their philosophies:

Muslim Arabs had come and settled *in large numbers* in South India between the seventh and the eleventh century and had won the respect of the Hindu Rajas and their subjects. They had been given complete freedom not only of faith and worship, but of propagating their religion and they took full advantage of this freedom. The zealous Muslims of this early period exercised wherever they went, in addition to direct religious influence by propagating their faith, *a healthy influence by re-awakening the religious spirit of the people among whom they lived*. So it is *very likely that the Bhakti and the Vedanta movements were to a considerable extent the result of the general religious awakening produced by contact with Islam*.

Not content with this flattering unction to the Muslim soul Professor Husain, later<sup>28</sup> in his chapter on the origin and the advent of Muslim culture in India harps on the theme of Islamic impact on the Bhakti movement and its strengthening in Northern India in the 13th to the 15th centuries. He says:

As soon as . . . Hindu and Muslim cultures came freely into contact with each other, *a new impetus was given to every aspect of life. The first and foremost was the impact of Muslim culture on religious life which took the form of Bhakti movement . . . It had first appeared in the south as an indirect result of contact between the Hindus and the Muslims*. In the beginning of the 13th century, when the Muslims had settled in Northern India and the religious ideas of the Muslim Sufis and Hindu saints had a direct impact on each other, *a more favourable atmosphere was*

<sup>27</sup> *Indian Culture*, p. 23. Italics mine.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32.

*created for the progress of the Bhakti movement.*

This statement stands in some contrast to that of Dr Yasin<sup>29</sup> who says that "Sufism and the Bhakti movement effaced the differences in creed to a certain extent", without suggesting the influence of the one system of mysticism on the other. On the other hand, it squares with that of the Hyderabad professor Dr Yusuf Husain<sup>30</sup> who says: "The Bhakti movement of mediæval India represents the first effective impingement on Hindu society of Islamic culture and outlook", adding further that "*the Reformation in Hinduism*" like Reformation in Europe, "*in the middle ages owed a great debt to Islam*".<sup>31</sup>

Muslim scholars in India have shown themselves to be more prone to ascribe many things to Islam in the history of religio-philosophical thought of India since it set its foot in the country. And their source of authority in general is Dr Tara Chand and the assertions made by him many years ago. It is therefore necessary to examine Dr Tara Chand's views and those of Aziz Ahmad, which formulated many years after Dr Tara Chand formed his own, were based on his only in part but added a new dimension to them through detailed examination of some Sufi doctrines and their parallels in Hindu mysticism.

To facilitate comprehension through a brief treatment I shall list the points to be settled as:

1. Islamic influence on Tamil hymnners;
2. Islamic influence on Siddhars;
3. Islamic influence on the doctrine and practice of the supreme importance of the spiritual preceptor;
4. Islamic influence on Shankaracharya;
5. Islamic influence on Ramanujacharya; and
6. Islamic influence on Ramananda and post-Ramananda saints of Northern and Western India.

The first four items are best treated together as they stand connected and subsume the "Bhakti-cult" with emotional content though purely monotheistic, importance of the spiritual preceptor being a side-product of the mystic ecstasy attained by the preceptor. The only additional element is that of alchemy and mysticism attained through such and other esoteric activity which is non-rational.

A. Barth,<sup>31</sup> the first systematic student of and writer on Hinduism, writing about 1879 and basing his observations on Caldwell and other writers on

<sup>29</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

<sup>30</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>31</sup> *The Religions of India*, pp. 209-19. Italics mine.

Tamil literature and language, propounded that a pure and an early form of Saivism was presented "in the Tamil poetical effusions of the *Sittars* (Skt. *Siddhas*) 'perfect ones' ". Pointing out that *very little of the sect, which was apparently extinct then*, was known, he noted the fact that the compositions were very popular in Tamil land, "notwithstanding the peremptory way in which they denounce the most cherished beliefs of the masses". About their age and pretensions to both antiquity and respectability he says:

*They are compositions, in general, of no great age, going back not more than two or three centuries, although they circulate under the names of the famous saints of antiquity* \*. . . . In elevation of style they rival the most perfect compositions which have been left us by Tiruvalluvar, Anuvayar, and the ancient Tamil poets. But at the same time, in their severe monotheism, their contempt for the Vedas and the Sastras, their disgust at every idolatrous practice and especially their repudiation of a doctrine so radical to Hinduism as metempsychosis they much more clearly betray a foreign influence.

Rejecting the suggestion of the earlier writers that the foreign influence reflected in the compositions of the Siddhars was Christian Barth rightly points out that their "rigid monotheism" reminds one more of the Koran.

Barth further notes that the Siddhars who were "zealous adepts" were "disciples of the Arabians" in alchemy "although other Saivitas had preceded them in the pursuit of the philosopher's stone".

Barth points out that the author of *Sarvagadarsanam* has devoted a whole chapter to "Rasavaradarsana" or "system of mercury", "a strange amalgamation of Vedantism and alchemy". The transubstantiation which the followers of this system thought was produced by the absorption of elixirs compounded of mercury and mica representing "the essential qualities of Siva and Gauri" constitutes *Virajamukti* or "the State of deliverance commencing with this present life". Barth asserts that under the garb of Vedantic terms the system hides "a radically impious doctrine" and that in the doctrine "which had from the fourteenth century produced a considerable literature, there is an infusion of Mohammedan ideas" \*.

Pondering over this fact and other developments in Hinduism associated with Shankara, Ramanuja, Anandavirtha and Basava from the 9th to the 12th century in the South "out of which the majority of the historical sects came and to which Hindustan presents nothing analogous till a much later period", and considering the proximity of both the Christian and the

\* Italics mine.

Islamic communities for considerable time before the period, Barth concludes:<sup>32</sup>

*To neither of these [Christians or Muslims] do we feel inclined to ascribe an influence of any significance on Hindu theology, which appears to us sufficiently accounted for by reference to its own resources; but it is very possible that indirectly, and merely as it were by their presence, they contributed in some degree towards the budding and bursting forth of those great religious reforms, which, in the absence of doctrines altogether new, introduced into Hinduism a new organisation and a new spirit, and had all this common characteristic that they developed very quickly under the guidance of an acknowledged head and rested on a species of authority akin to that of a prophet or an Imam.\**

So far we have collated together Barth's views on the religious thought and movements which Shankaracharya and Ramanuja started as also on the doctrines the Tamil Siddhars sponsored and the "possible" or "very possible" outside or foreign influence in their genesis, its nature and extent. Now we shall briefly present Barth's views on Bhakti movement and the status of the spiritual preceptor.

To Barth<sup>33</sup> *bhakti* "appears to be the necessary complement of a religion that has reached a certain stage of monotheism" and "is explicable as a native fact, which was quite as capable of realizing itself in India as it has done elsewhere in its own time, and independently of all Christian influence". Discarding the Christian hypothesis of the origin of Krishnaism and Bhakti-movement in India, Barth sums up the main and fundamental content of it which needs to be noted. Bhakti has "for its immediate object the divine being . . . under the most definite form, and with attributes the most personal. It addresses itself less to Vishnu than to Krishna or Rama, less to Siva than Bhairava, or some other of his manifestations." Quoting from the *Bhagavadgita*, Barth says that the genesis of *bhakti* in an individual is "either an *a priori* act of the will or a gift of God". In deciding in which of the two ways *bhakti* originates the sectarians elaborate the doctrine of grace and soon grace got "personified in Lakshmi or Radha", the theologians discussing the two positions being "often in close affinity with the Saktas".

"The more the doctrine of *bhakti* is developed in this way the more it became extravagant." Analyzing, with the mystic's own experience as his guide, the nature of the relation between the *bhakta*, or devotee, and "his" God, a distinction came to be made between "santi" or quiet, repose or calm and contemplative piety on the one hand, and "dasatva" or "the

<sup>32</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 212.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>33</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 220, 224-27.

slave state, surrender of the whole will to God" and "between this last and different degrees of the active sentiment of love, such as *sakhya*, friendship, *vatsalya*, filial affection, and *madhurya*, ecstatic susceptibility, *these last shades being peculiar rather to Vishnuites, but appearing also among certain peculiarly spiritualistic Saivite sects such as the Tamil Sittars [Siddhar]*".\*

Mentioning an illustrative example of human beings and animals going straight to *goloka*, "the supreme heaven of Krishna" narrated in the *Narada Panchratra*, Barth<sup>34</sup> points out, as closely connected with "these fanatical doctrines", "another characteristic feature of Hinduism, and the most noteworthy novelty, perhaps, in connection with the historic sects", the deification, namely, of the *guru*, founder, which almost always involves the duty of absolute devotion to the person of the existing *gurus*. In the Brahmanism of antiquity homage is paid to the holy men of ancient times, to the inspired founders of the school to which the worshipper belongs and the worshipper or the novitiate is asked to pay pious regard to his immediate "guru" or spiritual preceptor to the end of his life. But Barth insists that "from the twelfth century, on the contrary, the founder rises to the rank of Buddha or Jina; he becomes what the Prophet or the Imams are for the Moslem, a revealer, a supernatural saviour. He is confounded with the god of whom he is an incarnation". Barth instances Chaitanya, Vallabha and Nanak, and says that the most orthodox Vedantins claim for Shankaracharya, too, the same status; and instances the fact of the pontiff of Sringeri being known as *jagadguru*, or *guru* of the world, implying his infallibility.

Among Tamil hymnners, who may be said to begin to figure from about the 5th century or the 3rd century A.D., Barth<sup>35</sup> has mentioned Tiruvalluvar and his sister Auvaiyar. He says about the collection of songs of the former known as the *Kural* and of the songs of the latter that they are "gems of ancient Tamil literature" and "*instinct with the purest and most elevated religious emotion*". . . "*the authority of which the Brahmans accept without reservation*".\* It is known that these poets were Paraiyas or their priests. Barth does not mention either the Saiva Nayanars or the Vaishnava Alvars.

As regards the philosophy of Shankaracharya or even of Ramanujacharya Barth has not at all suggested any Muslim influence. He<sup>36</sup> has expressly stated that the doctrine that the souls of individuals, the *jivas* are "beings at once real and distinct from God" was known to Shankaracharya as the view of the *Pancharatras* or *Bhagvatas* and is condemned by him as being

\* Italics mine.

<sup>34</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 228-9.

<sup>35</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 157, 192.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>36</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 193.

against the *Śruti*, the revealed corpus of knowledge.

Another important point that Barth made about Shankaracharya is the contrast between Buddha's accredited teaching about the availability of his path to all in the words that "his law is a law of grace for all" and Shankaracharya's express declaration in his great commentary on *Brahma Sūtras* of Badarayana (I, 3) that a Shudra, not being entitled to study the Veda had no right "to receive and practice their teaching", was thus pronounced to be beyond redemption. In view of certain assertions made by Muslim writers quoted or referred to above regarding Shankaracharya's effort at strengthening Hindu system of thought and practice to meet the challenge of Islam, it is worthwhile noting the very pregnant remark of Barth about this attitude of Shankaracharya towards Shudras' incapacity for working for his salvation. Barth pointing out that Shankara, himself a Southerner, writing in the South, where "more than nine-tenths of the population were regarded by the Brahmanas as Shudras", observes: "It is evident that Brahmanism, in order not to die of exhaustion, was condemned to violate constantly its own peculiar principles, while Buddhism on the contrary, in order to spread wider, had only to practise its!"

About Ramanujacharya Barth<sup>37</sup> observes that he "successfully revived" in the 12th century the "qualified idealism" of the *Pancharātras* or the *Bhagavatas* rejected by Shankaracharya as a doctrine contradictory to the "*Śruti*".

Let us now see what Dr Tara Chand has to say on the subject. Quoting Fawcett's reference to the tradition about Shankaracharya being the incarnation of Shiva for the express purpose of upholding Brahmanism against the onroads of Islam, he says "the circumstance of his practical ex-communication with all his family by the Brahmanas, and his seeking a Nayar's aid in performing the rites of the dead on the demise of his mother point to the same conclusion" (p. 10). Unfortunately from Tara Chand's previous sentence it is not possible to know what exactly this "same conclusion" is, except that Shankara was a child widow's son and an incarnation of Shiva meant for reviving Hinduism. What is worse still is that on page 95 he has recorded the correct traditional reason which led to the Brahmanas of the locality objecting to Shankara's performing his mother's funeral in the standard manner, that he was a "sanyasi" and as such was not entitled to perform it. Immediately after this, asserting that Barth "argued in a similar strain", he quotes a sentence from his *Religious of India* which runs: "The Arabs of the Khalafat had arrived on these shores . . . to which Hindustan presents nothing analogous till a much later period", a part of which I have quoted above. And ignoring Barth's conclusion, which it was essential to state and which as quoted by me above under *italics* quite clearly speaks at best of only indirect stimulus than of

<sup>37</sup> *Op cit.*, pp 124-5.

<sup>38</sup> *Op cit.*, p 194.

any the least possible direct borrowing, Dr Tara Chand states his conclusion, without setting out any evidence, which is preposterous as it assumes not merely similarity but even identity of many "elements in the southern schools of devotion and philosophy with those of Muslim faith". Barth says—one must remember that his dictum comes immediately after his own enumeration of the four principal schools of philosophy which were systematized in the South, those of Shankaracharya, Ramanujacharya, Madhvacharya and Basava—

*It is necessary to repeat that most of the elements in the southern schools of devotion and philosophy, taken singly, were derived from ancient systems; but the elements in their totality and in their peculiar emphasis betray a singular approximation to Muslim faith and therefore make the argument for Islamic influence probable (p. 107).\**

Not being able to put his finger on a specific point of approximation and having to forestall an objection to his conclusion on that score, Tara Chand does not balk at maligning his glorious ancestors. He accuses them, the Hindus, of dissimulation in fact, though he apparently praises them for assimilation of foreign ideas with the most consummate skill so as to obliterate their identity beyond recognition. For he asserts on the supposed authority of Al-Beruni that the Hindus were "a proud race", and supports the contention by an appeal to "the history of the whole of Indian culture in the ancient period".<sup>10</sup> This charge as shown later in connection with Badr-ud-din Tyabji's accusation on the supposed authority of Al-Beruni is far from true.

Tara Chand has not revealed the special implement that has enabled him to read the identity of the camouflaged element either. Dr Tara Chand wanted to postulate Islamic influence on Shankaracharya and other glorious stars in the intellectual firmament of India and he does so without waiting for any evidence that will satisfy a scientific and critical student and thus

\* Italic mine

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 107-08. Dr Tara Chand does not provide the specific page-reference to Al Beruni's book, nor does he quote instances in substantiation of his concluding dictum. The fact of the matter is that there is no such assertion made by Al Beruni. What Al Beruni says is "They are haughty, foolishly vain, self-conceited and stolid" (I, p. 22), and "If they had travelled and mixed with other nations, they would soon change their mind, for their ancestors were not as narrow-minded as the present generation is." Instancing Varahamihira's exhortation to honour the Greeks for their science Al Beruni adds, "In former times, the Hindus used to acknowledge that the progress of science due to the Greeks is much more important than that which is due to themselves" (p. 23). Nor was Al Beruni so self-contradictory a person as to say what Dr Tara Chand imputes to him. For as Al Beruni has himself stated (I, pp. 153, 158-9) two of the Siddhantas of Indian astronomy are named after foreigners, one after a Greek and another after Rome and has mentioned the existence of a whole book on the subject of astrological sciences called *Yavana*, i.e., Greek.

presents a marked contrast to Barth, though coming almost three quarters of a century after him. I have already quoted in full Barth's conclusion.

Dr Tara Chand's incorrect statement that Shankaracharya "opened the ranks of Sannyasins to recruitment from all castes (p. 96)" points in the same direction. This liberalization of the monastic organization was accomplished either by Ramanand or still later by Madhusudana Saravati.<sup>40</sup> I shall state here only the fact that Barth sensed a stimulus to Shankaracharya's consciously planned monastic organization and its purposeful-looking spread in the presence of Islam in his part of the country.

Taking his cue from Dr Tara Chand, it would appear, or perhaps *sui generis*, Humayun Kabir went two or three steps further on the road to imposition of Islamic influence on Shankaracharya. After paying him compliments for both philosophical acumen and synthesizing genius he says,<sup>41</sup> without leading any evidence whatever:

There are reasons to think [What they are Kabir has not condescended to reveal to his readers!] that he also incorporated into his synthesis those elements of the teaching of Islam which were most suited to the genius of the land. *His extreme monism, his repudiation of all semblance of duality, his attempt to establish this monism on the authority of revealed scriptures, his tendency to regard his own activity as mere restoration of the original purity of the revealed truth are all elements which remind one strongly of the tenets of Islam.\**

And the Aligarh expert on Indian culture fashions a gem, evidently out of these utterances, when he<sup>42</sup> writes: "The way of *Advaita* shown by Shankaracharya" appears to be a "new movement in the religious history of India".

Those who desire to detect the influence of one set of doctrines on another have, first of all, to make sure of the categories represented therein and their history, if any, in a chronological framework. Shankaracharya's monism has a deep background and a long history in India. In a number of the famous passages of the *Upanishads* the identity of the Supreme Soul and the individual soul is stressed in telling phrases and images.<sup>43</sup> And Barth<sup>44</sup> wrote almost ninety years ago:

Alongside of Saivism . . . there is another which is inspired with the idealism of the Vedanta, and maintains consequently the essential unity

<sup>40</sup> See my *Indian Sadhus*, 2nd 1964, p. 227.

<sup>41</sup> *The Indian Heritage*, p. 88.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>42</sup> Abid Husain, *The National Culture of India*, p. 73.

<sup>43</sup> See my *Religious Consciousness*, 1965, pp. 133, 144-47, 224-29.

<sup>44</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 206-7. See also my *Gods and Men*, 1962, pp. 32-3.



of the world, the soul and God . . . . The Siva, for instance, who is invoked at the commencement of the drama of "Sakuntala", who is at once god, priest and offering or whose body is the universe, is a Vedantic idea. These testimonies appear to be forgotten when it is maintained, as is sometimes done, that the whole sectarian Vedantism commences with Sankara.

The next point to be decided is the time when, if at all, strict monism became a tenet in the corpus of Islam, along with the question whether such a doctrine is logically a consistent element of it as shown by the earlier and/or later history.

Let me start with the incontrovertible statement that Qoranic religion is monotheistic, conceiving God as Transcendent but not immanent in the manner in which an Advait-Vedantin thinks of Him. Strict monism insisting on the identity of God and the individual soul, so far as it is acceptable to any school of Islamic thought, is a later addition which a large majority of non-Sufist Muslims have rejected as almost un-Islamic.

The age of the thinker and mystic, who, first among Muslims, thought and preached in terms of the theoretical identity of God and the individual soul and spoke of his own achievement of that experience is crucial for arriving at a scientifically valid conclusion about influence.

From the valuable and illuminating account of Sufism so lucidly presented by Zaehner in his *Hindu and Muslim Mysticism*,<sup>45</sup> it is clear that it was Abu Yazid Bistami of Khorasan, who is known<sup>46</sup> to have died in A.D. 874, to whom this honour belongs. It is recorded of him that he said, "Glory be to me, I am the Lord most High" in a much more arrogant manner than the Indian sage Vamadeva is said to have done in a slightly round-about manner not less than 1500 years before Bistami, and Krishna is recorded to have done at least 1100 years before him. And Shankaracharya reasoning out a consistent form of strict monism, his Advaita Vedanta, lived from 788 to 820, i.e., had left this imperfect world about half a century before Bistami. There is thus not the least possibility of Shankaracharya, leaving aside the fact that such monism was in the atmosphere of India from about 800 B.C., having got any clue for his monism from any Muslim whatever as Bistami could have had it in his dogma at the most about 900 A.D.

Another saying<sup>47</sup> of Abu Yazid which is quoted as authentic reads: "I sloughed off myself as a snake sloughs off its skin, and I looked into my

<sup>45</sup> Pp. 93, 96-8, 111, 113, 116, 119-21.

<sup>46</sup> *E.B.*, 21, pp. 522-3; Zaehner, p. 111. Long ago Al Beruni (C.A.D. 1050) wrote (p. 88) about Abu-Yazid: "Abu-Yazid Albistami once being asked how he had attained his stage in Sufism, answered: "*I cast off my own self as a serpent casts off its skin.*" Then I considered myself and found that 'I' was 'He', i.e., God" Italics mine.

<sup>47</sup> Zaehner, p. 113.

essence (or self) and lo, I was He." Zachner quoting it, rightly comments that it "reads as a paraphrase of *Bṛhadaranyaka Upanishad*, 4.4.7,12". Zachner mentions the fact that R. A. Nicholson "long ago" had pointed out that Abu Yazid was the first to propound the doctrine of *fana*, meaning the annihilation of the self, as Yusuf Husain<sup>18</sup> renders it.

Aziz Ahmad,<sup>19</sup> writing after Zachner published his thesis that Sufi monism, which was developed by Abu Yazid, Abu Saud ibn Abil-Khayr and Hallaj, is Vedanta as propounded by Shankara dressed up in Muslim costume, though contesting the thesis, says that "The conceptions of Divine Unity and *fana* (annihilation) *inexplicably* appear first in the utterances of Abu Yazid of Bistam" and points out that Goldziher, who wrote some years before Zachner, too, considered the Sufi interpretation of Divine Unity (tawhid) as "fundamentally different from the Islamic monotheistic conception of God, and as borrowed from Indian theosophy". Mirza Mohd. Yousuf writing in 1962,<sup>20</sup> i.e., two years after Zachner and many years after Goldziher, sees only the Buddhist "*nirvana*" in *fana* of Biyazid (Abu Yazid) and exhorts that the nature and extent of 'the influence of Hindu pantheistic movements [?] on the development of later Sufistic doctrines' deserves to be worked out! The truth of the matter is that the history of Sufism shows its later practitioners and promulgators such as Mujaddid Sayyid Ahmed Sirhindi of the reign of Jehangir, to have strained every nerve to cast off or at least to blunt and blur the pantheistic heritage as being both un-Islamic and pro-Hindu.

Zachner has argued out the case for the influence of Shankaracharya on Abu Yazid in a very cogent manner no doubt; yet I feel that the space and even the time element are not quite favourable to such an interpretation. In the part of the world where Abu Yazid lived and experimented, Buddhism had taken deep roots for centuries and it is more likely that Buddhist concepts impinging themselves upon Abu Yazid combined with the thought and practice of Upanishadic and/or Patanjala system,<sup>21</sup> percolating through the learned men of Indian origin at Baghdad during Barmaeide<sup>22</sup> influence, should be credited with the influence.

At this stage, I should present a brief outline of the development of religio-philosophical thought in India, North and South from about the 3rd century B.C. to about the 7th century A.D. i.e., till the time when Muslims are said to have made settlements in the South and till the time of Shankaracharya's career about a century after that. For Dr Tara Chand

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 35. Dr Tara Chand's statement (*op. cit.*, p. 69) about *fana* that it was Abu Saud Karaz, who first explained the state as annihilation appears to be incorrect.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, 123, Italic mine.

<sup>20</sup> *Islamic Culture*, p. 111.

<sup>21</sup> Evidence for the currency of this system in India not only in the 10th century as evidenced by Al Beruni's account but also even before the 8th as vouchsafed by Bhavabhuti's references in his dramas will be found later in the book.

<sup>22</sup> Sachau, *Al Beruni's India* I, p. XXXI.

and persons of his way of thinking have staked their argument on the suddenness of Shankaracharya's appearance and thought and organization, as if coming out of the blue in an extremely confused atmosphere. Such an outline will be found necessary also in connection with the other link in the chain of the argument of these persons, that the devotional or Bhakti development, seen in the system of Ramanujacharya (A.D. 1017), is also a new movement, which first began among Tamil hymnists, owing next to nothing to North Indian culture, in short making it a Tamil gift to Indian culture, fashioned under Islamic influence.

To facilitate easy comprehension of the points at issue in the brief account that is possible here I shall treat of the history of the Hindu religious-philosophical thought under three topics: (1) Monistic thought, (2) Mystic thought and practice, and (3) "Bhakti" pattern and "guru" complex.

To begin with monistic thought one cannot insist too much that though the speculative thought of the *Upanishads* does not admit of a straight jacket of either monism or any other "ism", there are a number of passages in them of noble and soul-lifting words which enshrine nothing but monism, God, Brahman, of the universe and the God, and "atman", of the individual being declared to be the same. Yajñavalkya, the most advanced "advaitist" of the *Upanishads*, speaks of one of his two wives, Maitreyi, as "Brahmavadinī" (*B. & U.* II, 1; IV, 5, 7) i.e., as one who was philosophically minded, and we find that in his dialogue with her, he ends with the grand passage which begins with the proclamation of "advaita" in the words 'where there is duality one sees another as another . . . but where one realizes everything as 'atman' then one cannot see that there is another . . .'

The same sage, instructing his humbly approaching pupil Janaka, who, being a liberal and philosophy-minded king, offered his whole kingdom to his "guru" Yajñavalkya for imparting to him the esoteric Brahma-knowledge, declares at the end of his discourse (*B. & U.* IV, 1, 25) that one becomes this great "Brahmatman" when one realizes its immutability as well as its identity with one's own "atman".

Another great thinker of the age, Uddalaka Aruni, instructs his son Svetaketu in the final esoteric lore in the even more famous words, which have become the motto of "advaita" monism, after describing Brahman, the Supreme Soul, variously thus:

"And that 'Atman' thou art O. Svetaketu"; and the dictum is repeated in nine sections of one chapter (*Chh. U.* VI, 8-16). Sāṅdilya (*Chh. U.* III, 14-4) asserts at the end of his description of Brahman and "atman", individual soul, 'What this Brahman is is also my soul within my heart, and I am to be that Brahman after my departure from this world.'

In the *Mundaka Upanishad* (II, 2, 9-11 and III, 1, 3-5) the sage, having described the ubiquity of Brahman and its supreme transcendentality,

and having spoken of It and the individual soul as two friendly birds perched on one common tree, declares that the learned man who has understood the esoteric lore and sees the golden Purusha arising in Brahman, i.e., has had a vision of transfiguration of the Supreme, attains similarity with the Supreme and finds or feels or experiences the presence of the Supreme in himself in the form of pure white light. The same *Upanishad*, early in the text (I, I, 6-7) proclaiming the extreme subtlety, eternity, and ubiquity of Brahman as Akshara, explains the origin of the universe from It with the analogy of a spider threading out the web from its own womb and retracting it when its work is done. This analogy is repeated in the *Svetasvatara Upanishad* (VI, 10).

Pippalada, when asked about the Highest Purusha by Saurayani Gargya, ends his answer with the declaration (*Pr. U.*, IV, 10-11), "He becomes the Supreme Akshara (Brahman) who understands and realizes the non-red, white, shadowless and bodiless Being to be the same as the whole universe and the self."

The God of Death, Yama, confronted by the intrepid youth Nachiketas, the archetype of all truth-seekers, answering one question of that intelligent and inquisitive youth, using both fire and wind as analogies, says in one passage (*Ka U.*, II, 2, 9-15), as rendered by Dr S. Radhakrishnan,<sup>51</sup>

As fire which is one entering this world becomes varied in shape according to the object (it burns), so also the one Self within all beings becomes varied according to whatever (it enters) and also exists outside (them all). As air which is one, entering this world becomes varied in shape according to the object (it enters), so also the one Self within all beings becomes varied according to whatever (it enters) and also exists outside (them all). Just as the sun, the eye of the whole world, is not defiled by the external faults seen by the eye, even so, the One within all beings is not tainted by the sorrow of the world, as He is outside (the world). The one, controller (of all), the inner self of all things, who makes his one form manifold, to the wise who perceive him as abiding in the souls to them is eternal bliss - to no others. The one eternal amid the transient, the conscious amid the non-conscious, the one amid many, who grants their desires, to the wise who perceive Him as abiding in the soul, to them is eternal peace and to no others.

Even the *Svetasvatara Upanishad*, which is intensely theistic and absolutely monotheistic with Siva as the Supreme God, speaks of the realization of the identity of Isa with the super-atomic "atman", lying in the deepest recess of an individual, as leading to or producing freedom from sorrow, adding that the realization comes about through the grace of the Creator

<sup>51</sup> *The Principal Upanishads*, pp. 639-41.

(III, 19-21). It further asserts the immanence of Shiva in all the beings and adds the assurance that realization of this fact leads to individual immortality (IV, 16-20).

Three or so centuries later, the famous and popular *Bhagavadgita*, though an intensely theistic text of Krishnaism, carries forward the message of the unity of the Supreme Soul and the individual soul, treating it as the knowledge that leads to salvation, which is again nothing but union of the individual soul with the Supreme Soul.

True knowledge to be acquired in all humility from those who possess it is that which enables one to see all beings as oneself as well as the Supreme God, i.e., of the unity of the Supreme and the individual, and of the all-pervasive nature of the Supreme (*BhG*, IV, 35). Brahman is beginningless and all-pervasive yet transcendent; it is both within and without, i.e., both immanent and transcendent. It is stationed in one's heart too (*BhG*, XIII, 12-17). Great God is also known as Paramatman and is the same as the Purusha in the individual body (*ibid*, 22). In the theistic system the Supreme God is Krishna who pervades the universe in His non-manifest aspect so that though all are included in Him, He is not confined to any. With the same analogy as the *Upanishads* used, i.e., of wind, Krishna expounds this non-confined ubiquity of His (*BhG*, IX, 4-11). When one sees diversity melted into unity one becomes Brahman (*BhG*, XIII, 27-30). God is stationed in the hearts of all and it is He who makes them go on (*BhG*, X, 20; XIII, 2; XIII, 17; XV, 15; XVIII, 61). One who has mastered himself through "yoga" sees with utter equanimity because he sees himself as stationed in all and all in him. "One who sees Me (Supreme God Krishna) in all and all in Me is not lost and I do not let him down," i.e., such a one who has realized the unity of the individual self with the Supreme Soul and the latter as immanent, only waiting to be realized as such by individual selves, among all is a wholly successful spiritual traveller (*BhG*, VI, 29-31).

Shankaracharya's monistic philosophy or "advaita" is popularly known as "mayavada", the doctrine of illusion, the world as we see it being an appearance on the basis of the Reality, Brahman. In view of the role this "maya" plays in Shankaracharya's system it is interesting to note that the term occurs in the *Svetasvatara Upanishad* (IV, 10), Siva or Mahesvara being spoken of as "mayavin", one having (the power of) "maya" and the material basis as "maya". And very significantly the same *Upanishad* (I, 10) assures the inquirer that it is through meditation on and comprehension of the One God Siva that the "universal-maya" is dispelled. In the *Bhagavadgita*, too, the material basis is described as "maya" of the Supreme God Krishna, with the further addition that "maya" leads men astray, suggesting that "maya" is also a kind of ignorance (VII, 14-15). It is declared by the Lord that it is possible to get over this "maya", which, it is suggested, is the greatest hurdle between one and one's realization of the

unity of the individual soul and the Supreme Soul. As it is announced elsewhere (V, 15) creatures get lost because their knowledge is covered or blighted by "ajñāna", ignorance or nescience of later philosophy.

*Manusmṛiti*, a highly authoritative and widely used sacred text guiding the religious thought and practice as well as the social sentiments and behaviour of Hindus for more than sixteen hundred years, is dated as about four centuries later than the *Bhagavadgītā*. It declares that one who sees self in all creatures and all creatures in oneself and thus attains total equanimity wins self-government or does not commit any sin or again attains the Supreme Brahman (XII, 91 and 118-9, 125).

About two centuries later the national poet of India, Kālidāsa, in his felicitous expression of the most significant part of the Brahma-doctrine, announced speculatively in the *Upanishads* and authoritatively in the *Bhagavadgītā*, drove it home at least to the elite of his and succeeding generations. Though he was himself a Śaiva, a confirmed theist with Śhiva as his personal God, he wove the Brahma-doctrine equally charmingly round both Śhiva and Viṣṇu. I have already mentioned above that Barth, while discussing the origin of Śaṅkarāchārya's monistic philosophy, pointed out, mentioning the first verse of *Shakuntalā*, that the monistic idea centred round Śhiva was already there in Kālidāsa. I have given a summary of Kālidāsa's invocations in his six well-known works in my *Gods and Men*.<sup>4</sup> All the invocations are to Śhiva wherein Kālidāsa "presented Śhiva as his cosmic and super-cosmic deity, the Supreme God with personal attributes, and the Transcendental Principle", Brahma of the Vedāntins.

In the present context it is necessary to offer some additional data from Kālidāsa as it is the most crucially significant evidence of the currency of 'advaita'-philosophy among the elite at least, even when the enthronement of both Śhiva and Viṣṇu as personal Gods was almost complete. And it was because of this fully pantheistic monism as the thread in all religious ramifications that intellectuals like Kālidāsa could feel equally at home with Śhiva as the personal God or/and Viṣṇu as such, both being Brahman in personal form and therefore fundamentally one.

In the highly lyrical poetry of *Meghadūta*, Kālidāsa has incidentally described Śhiva in Vedāntic terms which contrast very markedly with those employed by him in his delineation of Skanda, the son of Śhiva, the infant commander of the God's armies against the most powerful demon, highly favoured as the deity of some of the foreigners naturalized in India in the early centuries of the Christian era, and also adopted to a large extent by some of the great Gupta monarchs. Speaking of Śhiva Chandisvara as "Tribhuvanaguru", the preceptor of the three worlds (the universe) (v, 33), while describing the famous temple of Śhiva Mahakālā at Ujjayīni, Kālidāsa asks the cloud messenger to be useful to Śhiva in his wonted dusk-dance (v, 36). He exhorts it to worship Skanda on his further advance

referring only to Skanda's peculiar birth and mission and enlisting respect for him through a mention of Bhavani's, i.e., Parvati's, great affection for Skanda (vv. 43-45). It is when Kalidasa brings his cloud messenger near the Himalayan abode of Siva, that his poetic and emotional self bursts forth into a paean which is characteristically the kernel of sectarian fundamentals of later days. He<sup>55</sup> says: "Reverently go round the Foot-print of Siva, clearly impressed on a rock, to which the Siddhas (a group of semi-divine beings) daily offer worship, which being seen, the faithful (śraddhadhana) have their sins washed clean after the cessation of their senses and eventually attain the abiding position of a Gana (follower) of Siva."

In the *Kumarasambhava* (II, 58; III, 45-50; VI, 16, 21-3; 75-77) Kalidasa breaks out into a more positively Vedantic and Yogic terminology in delineating Siva as he appeared to the Gods and sages and manifestly to people like him in his generation. Elsewhere<sup>56</sup> I have translated some of the verses noted above and have concluded:

It is clear that to Kalidasa, and presumably to Indians of Kalidasa's time, Shiva was not only the Supreme God but also Paramatman or Paramesvara, and as such was not merely the Destroyer-aspect of the Supreme but the Unity of all the three aspects, supposed to be distributed among the three Supreme Gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva. Perception of the unity of the Supreme God-head, though named variantly, was thus the central core of the religious consciousness of the Indians of Kalidasa's time.

I should further add from Kalidasa's description:

He is the inner soul of all embodied beings. He is not to be seen embodied but is to be felt" (VI, 21-3) "Yogis seek Him in their hearts" (VI, 77) Shiva Himself goes into meditative trance and seeks Himself in His heart: for being the Atman that Yogis and others seek in their own hearts Shiva's seeking Atman in Himself is seeking Himself inwards. (III, 15-50).

Even more Vedantic in terminology, though shot through with even a fervent emotion, is Kalidasa's hymn of praise framed for the gods and addressed by them to Vishnu Seshasayi in *Raghuvamśa* (X, 15-32) to induce Him to take human form to kill Ravana.

Vishnu stands in the heart of everyone; He is desireless, engaged in austerities, ancient, untouched by sorrow, merciful and ageless. He is all-knowing and yet unknown; generating all yet Himself self-born; all

<sup>55</sup> *Mehaduta*, V, 55. The rendering is Dr A. C. Paranjape's in his edition of the text.

<sup>56</sup> *Religious Consciousness*, p. 241.

powerful yet helpless, and though One takes all forms Nobody knows Him thoroughly; for though unborn He incarnates Himself, though desireless He kills enemies, and though sleeping He is all awake. Vishnu first creates the universe, then protects it and lastly destroys it and thus He manifests Himself in three aspects. Vishnu, Himself non-manifest, is the cause of the manifest universe. Yogis seek Him as He appears in an individual's heart in the form of Light, so that they may attain liberation. All the variant schools of philosophical thought which are formulated as paths to salvation have only one goal i.e. Vishnu and are like so many streams that have to and do merge in the ocean. Vishnu is the sole means of liberation and non-return for men who fix their minds in Him, dedicate all their work to Him and rise over desires. The vast greatness of the earth and other created things is manifest; greatness of Vishnu, who can be understood only through the words of the experts and inference but not directly must be limitlessly vast. There is nothing that Vishnu has not, there is nothing that He wants to obtain and yet He takes birth and acts only to oblige the world and bless it. Vishnu purifies men even if He is simply remembered by them, i.e. even if they utter only his name. This fact is sufficient to give an idea of the enormous beneficial results that must ensue from other behaviour towards Him, like worshipping, seeing, and touching, which are progressively intenser forms of intercourse and contact.

No one would fail to note in this majestic hymn of praise. (which of course suffers from my utter inability to phrase it properly in English) the completely monistic core of the unity of the Supreme God and the individual soul, of the identity of the Supreme God and the non-personal Brahman. One can see that the theory that the realization of the individual soul as the Supreme Soul is not by itself adequate to secure final liberation but that the grace (though not named in the exact phraseology of the later Bhakti-cult but only mentioned in indirect terms like "gati" and "sarana") of the personal God—in this case Vishnu—is required to be secured is there at least in embryo.

In the later and fully developed *bhakti*-Cult "nama-smarana", i.e., name-utterance as it is called—the so-called easiest of the ways of seeking spiritual uplift of the later cult—is specifically mentioned, while it is also distinctly suggested that the reward for this and such other methods of the cult complex would be eternal abode by the side of the personal God.

About two centuries later, lived another of the Great Sanskrit poets whose testimony in this behalf is even more significant in the particular context of our discussion. For Bharavi, the poet, who is dated as not later than A.D. 550, lived<sup>57</sup> at Kanchi and thus in the particular Southern re-

<sup>57</sup> S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, *Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture*, Vol. I, pp. 584-6.



gion, where the influence of Islamic religious thought and practice has been postulated and the source of the purely Tamilian origin and development of the *bhakti*-complex has been fixed by Dr Tara Chand and his followers. Bharavi's only extant work is a semi-epical poem called *Kiratar-juniya*, describing Arjuna's austerities undertaken to propitiate Siva to arm himself with divine weapons and his trial by Siva in the guise of a hunter ("kirata"). It should be noted that Arjuna's penance finds its finest and perhaps the earliest representation in the sculptures of the "ratha"-temples of Mahabalipuram near Madras!

In the course of the bitter fight in which Arjuna's mettle was sorely tried at last Shiva, whom Bharavi now refers to as "Parapuman", Supreme Person, equalling Vaishnava epithet of Vishnu or Krishna as "Purushot-tama", the Best of Men, in his own "very beautiful form" embraced Arjuna to his own bosom very warmly. Bharavi (XVIII, 14) commenting on this special favour shown to Arjuna by Shiva, i.e., by Shiva to His devotee, says: "The Lord was highly pleased with Arjuna not so much by his austerities as by the spirit he had shown." When Arjuna realized, particularly through the loud cheers of the divine troupes of Shiva, that he had attained the highest of benefits accruing from austerities, viz., a direct vision of the Supreme God, Shiva, he offered his heartfelt prayers thus:<sup>59</sup>

"You are the refuge of the universe. You are easily appealed to through *bhakti*. People resort to you who are very merciful and thereby become immortal. People giving away immensely in charity in reference to You and seeing that the world is full of miseries resort to You for liberation. You, too, do your part of the work and grant them liberation not because you have any desire for being served but because of sheer mercifulness. You are the sacred spot that secures one's spiritual future without one having to visit it; for You guarantee it even if you are merely remembered. One who has love for you ('priti-man') attains salvation. That result, however, O boon-grantor, ensues because of Your natural greatness and not because you become partial towards your devotee. O, Bhava, you are kind to those who appeal to you, so much so that even persons who have not subdued their passions, and thus have not cultivated true knowledge ('jnana') achieve freedom from rebirth if they remember You with deep devotion. Anyone who sees right and does right i.e., one who combines the 'jnanamarga' and 'karmamarga'—in the synthetic manner later elaborately and convincingly propounded by Shankaracharya,—no doubt achieves liberation. But such a one comes by proper knowledge and resorts to right action because he resorts to You as the 'Para', i.e., as the Supreme Being, i.e. a man's attainment of true knowledge and resort to proper activity are results of his devotion to Shiva, the Highest Being.

<sup>59</sup> This is a brief summary of verses 22-42 of the XVIII chapter of Bharavi's *Kiratar-juniya*.

"You grant liberation to such sages as have conquered their passions by their own efforts and having attained proper knowledge teach the common people and thus oblige the world. Not only that but You dispel the binding actions of common men who without being able to achieve their mastery or their knowledge seek refuge in You [*upeta* = '*prapanna*']. You are beyond '*maya*'<sup>50</sup> (the power of illusion possessed by '*prakriti*', the material element known commonly as '*mula prakriti*' or '*mulanaya*') the force that binds one to the material world; yet You sport this form, which is but an appearance, being merciful, in order to help people to avoid spiritual downfall. Your mind is passionless yet Your sportive and erotic dalliance with Your consort is well known. You carry your consort in your body as your half \* and yet You are known to have burnt down Passion-God. You offer your obeisance to Brahman in the morning \*\* though You are Yourself the object of people's obeisance.

"O, Bhava, whatever victory the Gods or the demons ever secured was the result of their humble and respectful homage rendered by them to You who are in the habit of dispelling the distress of all those who seek refuge in You ('*saranagata*'). You forgive those who seek refuge in You all offences committed by them in ignorance even if they were perpetrated against You."

In this hymn of praise, addressed by Bharavi through the role of Arjuna to Siva, one can see a replica, a longer one and a more pronouncedly theistic "bhakti"-patterned one, of Kabdas's addressed to Vishnu. Here can be seen a working compromise between the Vedantic doctrines of the only reality being Brahman, its occultation for individuals through "*maya*" and the dutiful and righteous routine to be lived for getting over it. Here are also evident the "bhakti"-doctrines of seeking refuge, whether named as "*sarana*" or as "*upeta*" or in the form of "*prapatti*", and of the grace of Siva. Here also is present the goal achieved by staunch Saiva devotees in the form of "*salokata*" and "*samipata*", i.e., being members of the immortal troupes of Siva's attendants and associates "*Gana*".

Leaving out this special hymn composed by Bharavi, though it could not have been worded in the terms he has used unless the corpus of religious doctrines and the atmosphere of his times were favourable to them I should mention, as of special significance, Bharavi's casual reference, one that is made in passing and not in a specially composed hymn, to

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Svetasvatara Upanishad*, IV. 10 "*Mayan tu prakritim vidvat mayinam tu maheshvaram*".

\* The reference is to the Ardhanaryatesvara form of Siva.

\*\* The reference is to Siva's offering the daily Saurdhya adoration. It is important as showing that the synthesis between the daily routine of living, in both its material and spiritual aspects, was conceived as having been demonstrated by Siva himself.

absorption in Brahman as the goal of all individual spiritual endeavour, and also the obstruction put in its way by ignorance, "ajñāna", or nescience, "avidyā". Remarks Bharavi about the Himalayan spot chosen by Arjuna (*Kiratarjuniya*, V, 22): "This mountain generates knowledge capable of securing freedom from rebirth as potent as the system of philosophy designed to remove darkness or nescience ("tamas" \* = "avidyā") of those seekers of liberation whose objective is union with pure and supreme Brahman."

The dramatist Sudraka, who must have written his well-known play, *Mricchakatika* (Toy-cart) before the 6th century A.D., in his invocation to Siva, more or less repeats Kalidasa's description of Siva as a "Yogi" engaged in the act of realizing Himself in Himself, i.e., realizing the Supreme Brahman as the individual "atman", positing unity of self and Brahman.

Dramatist Bhavabhūti,<sup>60</sup> a native of Berar, is known to have composed his works about 725 A.D., i.e., about two or three generations before Shankaracharya. And he describes his lineage, named Udumbara, as that of Brahmvādins, those who hold Brahma, the Supreme Principle, and the individual soul to be one. Bhavabhūti mentions or refers to at least four ascendant generations of his and informs us that the lineage was engaged in conducting a school of that philosophy, since when we cannot say. We may conclude that in Berar, a definitely non-North Indian region, professors of monism,—whether they could be called "mayavādins" is not at all clear—who were Brahmins, were carrying on the activity of propagating that philosophy, and also other ones I should think, at least for two centuries before Shankaracharya formulated his "Mayavāda"—monism and galvanized the whole country with it. Bhavabhūti<sup>61</sup> assumes Brahmvādins as the highest Brahmins worthy to be done homage to by all. At least five times in the play *Mahaviracharita*, Bhavabhūti<sup>62</sup> takes care to mention through one or the other character, including Janaka himself, that Janaka, the father of Sita, and far famed in the *Upanishads* as liberal in his gifts to those beginning with the sage Yajñavalkya, who were able to expound the monistic philosophy known as Brahmavāda, was either a person who was initiated into that philosophy by Yajñavalkya, who is declared to have been the pupil of the Sūrigod, or as having realized the Supreme Brahman in himself. Bhavabhūti has repeated the statement that Janaka had received his instruction in Brahma-philosophy from Yajñavalkya at least once in his greatest work *Uttararamacharita* (IV, 9).

Besides Bhavabhūti, has affirmed<sup>63</sup> through Janaka, his conviction,

\* Reminiscent of the *B & U*, I, 3, 23; "Tamaso ma jyotir gamaya" or even Kalidasa's (*Kumarasambhava*, II, 58) "tamaso paścā vyavasthitam".

<sup>60</sup> *Mahaviracharita*, after v. 3; *Malatimadhava*, after v. 4.

<sup>61</sup> *Mahaviracharita*, IV, 21.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 14; II, 43; III, 5; III, 25-26.

<sup>63</sup> *Mahaviracharita*, I, 12.

which must be taken to be the tradition current in his time, that sages like Visvamitra had visualized Brahman, "sakshatkrita-brahman". And Siva himself is said to have instructed Parasurama not only in the art of weapons but also in the esoteric knowledge of Brahman.<sup>64</sup> Going a step further Bhavabhuti has obliged us by vouchsafing the very important information, through his character Vasistha, that the practice of the most esoteric technique of Yoga was known to him as practised by some at least and that it enabled the adept practitioner to visualize Brahman. The vision revealed by the mental power "Jyotishmati" attained through Yoga was called "ritambhara", truth-bearing, and consisted of purest internal effulgence.<sup>65</sup>

Yogic technique even more pronounced in its Shaiva connection and even Shakta affiliation along with its peculiarly sectarian yet monistic achievement, which therefore may indicate the existence of one school of Saiva doctrine almost fully formed and in actual practice then, is mentioned in by the poet-dramatist in his social play *Malatimadhava* (V, 1-2). It reiterates that part of the anatomy and physiology of the internal structures of the human body which since the oldest of the *Upanishads*<sup>66</sup> has provided the source of some esoteric techniques of gaining mastery over self and achieving mystic transcendental experiences.

The Shakta votary Kapalakundala, engaged in the pursuit of procuring a young girl as a victim for the final sacrifice on the completion of a certain complex of observances, calculated to secure magical powers or "siddhi" in Sanskrit technical language, is made by Bhavabhuti to reveal the mystical doctrine. She, complimenting herself on her achievement in coming all the way from mount Shri-Shaila or Sri-Parvata in the South to Padmavati in Berar or in Madhya Pradesh, delivers one of the cardinal tenets of monistic school of Saivism, hailing from the time of the *Svetasvatara Upanishad*, that "atman" possesses the form of Siva and is sighted as placed in the mist of the finely interwoven lotus-like receptacle of veins in the midst of one's heart through appropriate Yogic technique, which she has been able to master and call into action. Bhavabhuti further reveals to us through her the doctrine of some Shaiva schools that Atman stationed in the centre of the web of veins in the heart-lotus is known as Shaktinatha, the Lord of Powers, being surrounded by them and that He when sought there, i.e., sighted there in one's self, through appropriate technique, grants mystic powers or liberation. The seekers, those who persist in realizing Siva as Shaktinatha in their hearts in place of their selves, were known as "sadhakas", seekers of "siddhi".\*

Kapalakundala was a Kapaliki belonged to the Kapalika and Aghora

<sup>64</sup> *Mahaviracharita*, III, 37.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, III, after v. 4.

<sup>66</sup> See *My Indian Sadhus* (2nd ed.), pp. 129-31.

\* It may not be too far-fetched to seek the origin of Tamil 'Siddhars' in these.

sects. Neither her "siddhi" nor the particular power used by her is named. But the magical power, which Saudamini, another character in the play, who is called a Yogini, possessed is called "akshepini", conveyer (*Malati-madhava*, IX, 52).

The Kananji dramatist Bhatta Narayana, writing his play *Venisamhara* about the end of the 8th or the beginning of the 9th century at the royal court of Bengal, uses an expression in the final valedictory stanza which, with all the differences of opinion among commentators and critics and the variant readings, cannot but be interpreted as evincing an "advaita" philosophy with "bhakti" as its final end. He wishes that people will cultivate "bhakti" devotion to Purushottama, i.e., Krishna as Supreme God, without any duality, "dvaitam vina". One who is conversant with Jñanesvara's commentary on the *BhG*, XVIII, 55, cannot fail to recognize in this an early and an embryonic archetype of Jñanesvara's ideal of "bhakti", after realizing the complete unity of self and Brahman, mystically yet so beautifully described by him in verses 1151 to 1217 of chapter XVIII.

The atmosphere of India was thus full of monistic thought-currents since the 8th or the 9th century B.C. to about the 9th century A.D. in the case of North India and from about the 5th century to within a generation or two of Shankaracharya in South India. Even the doctrine of "Maya" as an explanation of the apparent contradiction of the monistic theory was there in embryo, though perhaps not consistently applied.

From about the 4th century B.C. writers on various topics in Sanskrit are in evidence in South India, the "Dharma"-writer Apastamba being perhaps the earliest. If Bhasa, the unique dramatist, who must have flourished about the 2nd century A.D., could be certainly accredited to South India, and not probably only as at present,<sup>67</sup> then we could affirm the entrance of South India in the picture of Indo-Aryan culture as an equal partner with North India about that time. For Nagarjuna, the celebrated Buddhist philosopher, whose work in the cause of Buddhist philosophy is credited with great success and who is commonly accepted to be the acutest of such philosophers, was a native of Vidharba and lived in the 2nd century A.D. The great influence this philosopher had over Buddhists is concretized in the celebrated "stupa" of Nagarjunikonda on the Krishna. It is said of him that "the Madhyamika system seems to have been perfected at one stroke by the genius of the founder of it, Nagarjuna himself. In the fourth or fifth century Buddhist philosopher, Dīnganaga was a resident of Kanchi. In the 6th century A.D. Chandrakīrti further championed the cause of monism in this school of Buddhist philosophy."<sup>68</sup>

I have already mentioned above Bharavi, his great semi-epical poem,

<sup>67</sup> U. Venkatakrishna Rao has advanced some arguments supporting his contention that Bhasa hailed from South India in *Journal of Indian History*, 1958, pp. 112-3.

<sup>68</sup> V. W. Karambelkar in *Journal of Indian History*, 1952, p. 25; *History of Philosophy*, I, pp. 205-6. V. V. Mirashi, in *Nava Bharata*, (Marathi), April 1967, p. 36.

and the fact of his having lived and worked at Kanchi. Perhaps a generation later another influential person was providing a good deal of literature on alchemy which was, or came to be, associated with a monistic school of Yogic sectarians. That is Nagarjuna, who is invoked as one of the twenty-seven alchemists and who was at Sri-Parvata, the famous centre of Kapalikas and other "siddhi"-experts and "siddhi"-learners, even in the 8th century A.D. He is believed to have lived about the end of the 5th century A.D. V. W. Karandhelkar,<sup>69</sup> who has obliged us with disclosing a comparatively unknown chapter in cultural history, notes Al-Beruni's mention of Nagarjuna and his ascription of him to the region near Somnath in Saurashtra. Al-Beruni, however, dates his Nagarjuna as only a century earlier than his own time. Al-Beruni's Nagarjuna must, therefore, be another person much later than our Nagarjuna.

In the first quarter of the 7th century a Pallava king of Kanchi wrote a play in Sanskrit with representatives of the Kapalika, the Bauddha and the Pashupata sects as the characters, depicting their extravagances and bringing them at the end round to the view that it was possible for them all to carry on co-existence. And the continuity of the tradition in this region is made manifest by the simile used by the dramatist to recommend this co-existence which is that of Kirata and Arjuna, the epithets that make up the name of Bharavi's great poem *Kiratarjuniya*, very probably written here.

In between Bharavi and the Pallava king-playwright we have the famous story-teller almost unique in Sanskrit literature, who was also one of the early writers on Sanskrit poetics, Dandin, who describes himself as Bharavi's great-grandson.<sup>70</sup> He is generally considered to be a contemporary of the famous romance-writer of the North, Bana.

Before Badarayana in North India, had composed his *Brahmasutras*, giving in a nutshell and mnemonic form, the tenets of Brahman-philosophy or Vedanta, Jainini, had rendered similar service to the cause of the philosophy of Dharma or ritualistic pattern of living and religious goal, raising what is called "apurva", "unique", i.e., the complex of unseen consequences of one's activity, into a sort of God. The dichotomous division of Vedic Brahmanism which had made its appearance in the attitudes of the personages figuring in the older *Upanishads*, though it was attempted to be synthesized in the *Bhagavadgita*, had evidently gone on developing in spite of the onslaught which Buddha's doctrines, and of their sponsoring and spread by Asoka, must have made on the ritualistic way of life. For the first resurgence of Brahmanism after its partial eclipse in North India was proclaimed by a famous sacrifice of the Vedic repertory, performed about 150 B.C. by a Sunga monarch, resounding through the great grammatical work of Patanjali and the charming and appealing drama *Malavikagni-*

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 26-31

<sup>70</sup> S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, *op. cit.*, p. 585.

*mitra*, of the national poet, Kalidasa.

Small wonder, therefore, that of the two great and more or less contemporary books in the catechistic form, one on the Brahma-philosophy and the other on Dharma-philosophy, i.e., of the ritualistic pattern of living and religious goal, the latter found its commentator earlier. We have the work of one Sabararswami known as *Sabara bhashya* on Jaimini's *Sutras*, which antedates its analogue, *Shankarabhashya* on Badarayana's *Sutras* by four to five centuries.

Though theism centred round Siva and his son Skanda had begun to come to the fore with some of the foreign dynasties ruling in North India between about 1 B.C. to about 300 A.D., and that centred round Vishnu-Vasudeva during the same period but mostly outside royalty of the North and among royalty only south of the Narmada, it was not till the Imperial Guptas championed Vaishnavism that theism can be said to have been stabilized as the focus of Indian religious consciousness. Of these great Guptas, Samudragupta, the first great monarch, celebrated his success with the performance of a horse-sacrifice, "asvamedha". But as for inscriptional or literary evidence so far available can tell us there is no other vedic sacrifice recorded to have been performed in North India, even by the other Gupta monarchs who performed the "asvamedha". The only exception to this appears to be the "triratna" sacrifice recorded to have been offered by a Maukhari prince in a Kotah district inscription of about 238 A.D.

On the other hand, some inscriptions from Damodarpur, Dinajpur district, of the middle of the 5th century A.D., or the one from Mallasarul, Burdwan district of the first half of the 6th century A.D., recording an endowment-grant to a Brahmin in order that he may carry on his usual Brahmanic duties of daily domestic sacrifices is an indication that even the daily so-called sacrifices, the "Panchamahayajnas" of the law-books, had come to be avoided by some Brahmins<sup>71</sup> in North India.

The South Indian (Andhra) Satavahanas<sup>72</sup> went one better in point of the performance of horse-sacrifice, some of their members having celebrated the great sacrifice symptomatic of martial prowess, twice about the latter half of the first century B.C. In addition, what is important for our purposes, they performed more than half a dozen other Vedic sacrifices which had not that connection with martial prowess and were purely Vedic ritualism.

From about the latter part of the 3rd century A.D. scions of the Ikshvaku family of Kanchi<sup>73</sup> recording at the famous Buddhist centre of Nagarjunikonda testify to their having celebrated not only the royal victory-proclaimer horse-sacrifice but also at least three or four other Vedic sacrifices whose performance in the earlier period was registered by the Satavahanas.

<sup>71</sup> D. C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 92-3, 278, 285-7, 359-61.

<sup>72</sup> D. C. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-90.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 227-31.

The Vakataka dynasty of Vidarbha, Berar, which was politically important enough to induce the Imperial Guptas to form a matrimonial alliance with it by giving in marriage one of their princesses to a Vakataka prince, went further, one of their early kings having performed four horse-sacrifices<sup>71</sup> in the 4th century A.D., and also six other Vedic sacrifices, two of them being different from the half dozen performed by the Satavahana scions.

The Pallavas of Kanchi<sup>72</sup> almost about the same time further south were performing not only the horse-sacrifice but also two other of the Vedic sacrifices performed by the Satavahanas.

D. C. Sircar,<sup>73</sup> writing in 1942, remarked on the performance of the Satavahanas: "The number of sacrifices proves the great influence of the Vedic Karmakanda [ritualism] in the early Satavahana court."

It is in this context of religious practice in South India and the persistent attacks of the Buddhistic teachers and philosophers like Vasubandhu and Dīghanaga that we have to view Kumarila Bhatta's rise and work in South India. Kumarila Bhatta,<sup>74</sup> commenting on Shabaraswami's commentary on the Sūtras of Jaimini in the 7th century A.D., is believed to have counteracted the Buddhistic onslaught. The faith in Vedic sacrifices, indicated by the religious practice of the South during four to five centuries before Kumarila Bhatta, demonstrates the fact of the field being quite ready to receive and nourish the seed of the philosophy of Vedic ritualism. And there arose Kumarila Bhatta, a son of that soil, Andhra Pradesh, to grasp the noble opportunity. Once critical thought, critical within the framework of Vedic authority, had started, a divergent school or schools of thought was a probability; and Prabhakara Bhatta,<sup>75</sup> the pupil of Kumarila Bhatta, also a Southerner, led another school of the religio-philosophy called Purva Mimamsa. About their thought and work R. G. Bhandarkar observed more than half a century ago: "But the Mimamsakas attacked not only the Buddhists, but the Aupanishadas, or a school of thought based upon the Upanishads." It is gratifying for me to note that according to Dr V. V. Mirashi, Mimamsaka system of religious thought was assiduously cultivated since Kumarila Bhatta's time in Kerala, Shankaracharya's region (*Navabharata*, December 1965, p. 152).

In North India where Saivism or rather Sivatheism was well formulated during the Indo-Parthian period, we know that a special school of it known

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 406-8, 418-21. The inscription refers to the Bharashivas, the maternal ancestors of the early Vakatakas as a family which had celebrated ten horse-sacrifices. This reference not being supported by independent evidence may be taken to be exaggeration!

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 437-42.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 189.

<sup>74</sup> *History of Philosophy, Eastern and Western*, Vol. 1, ed. by S. Radhakrishnan (2nd ed.), pp. 36, 258, 265, 268, 269-70.

<sup>75</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 51.



as Pasupata was started or propounded with new vigour by one Lakulisa, who lived in Saurashtra, Gujarat, about 200 A.D.<sup>79</sup> About the time Shankaracharya formulated his grand system of philosophy in the far South, Shaiva Siddhanta school, whose fundamental doctrine is monism centred round Shiva, was being developed in the far off North, in Kashmir by Vasugupta in the beginning of the 9th century.<sup>80</sup>

That North India had begun to follow up the trails of philosophico-religious thought of Badarayana is proved by the "*karikas*" of Gaudapada, who is ascribed to a time not later than 500 A.D. by some and by others to the second or third generation before Shankaracharya who looked upon him as his virtual preceptor.<sup>81</sup> In these circumstances of religio-philosophy in India, North and South, about 750 A.D., if Shankaracharya arose and formulated a system which tied down all other thought and practice we need only concede the title of a genius to him and need not go out to seek some very problematically possible influence on his philosophical system.

How about the active and organizational part of his immense activity in the short span of life he had? Here, too, the following brief narration of accredited facts should convince any unbiassed reader that nothing more than the acceptance of Shankaracharya as an extraordinary person is necessary. And such persons have arisen in this land from time to time, but for which fact this Indian culture could not have succeeded in continuing a fairly vigorous and the longest-known existence among world's cultures, more than about one dozen of which have vanished into the limbo of time!<sup>82</sup>

Buddhist "viharas", Buddhist monks, their propagandist activity, and their monastic organization existed in India for at least eight to nine centuries before Shankaracharya came on the scene. Some of the Saiva sects, too, must have had their propagandist ascetics moving round the country for a few centuries, at least after a definite individual of the name of Lakulin or Lakulisa had preached his interpretation of the Saiva doctrines. As a matter of fact the very word "matha" meaning a monastic centre, the foundation of five such having been credited to Shankaracharya, is more than three centuries older than him. As pointed out by me elsewhere the popular Sanskrit work *Panchatantra*<sup>83</sup> records the existence of "mathas", distinguishing them as "vidyamatha" and "mathayatana", centre for disseminating learning and temple-centre, and alludes to the task of managing

<sup>79</sup> R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaishnavism, Saivism etc.*, p. 129; V. S. Pathak, *Saiva Cults in Northern India*, p. 9., See my *Gods and Men*, pp. 25-6.

<sup>80</sup> J. N. Farquhar, *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, 1920, pp. 193-4.

<sup>81</sup> Amarnath Ray in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. VIII, 1935-37, pp. 107-11.

<sup>82</sup> *Indian Sadhus*, 2nd ed., pp. VII, 41-2, 224, S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, *Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture*, I, pp. 800-64.

<sup>83</sup> *Indian Sadhus*, 2nd ed., 1964.

such "mathas", where ascetics took abode, as rather very taxing. Organization of ascetics with residential arrangement called "mathas", the work of some of which consisted in spreading knowledge, was not an utterly unknown phenomenon locally and indigenously in Shankaracharya's time. And what is most important in the present context is that one such centre, "matha", is mentioned as existing even before the 6th century A.D., at Mylapore near Madras.

Shankaracharya, therefore, cannot be deprived of the credit of formulating his grand philosophical system, of using disputational technique and endeavour, and of starting organizational enterprise purely out of the indigenous sources and his own resourceful nature.

Shankaracharya's individual greatness is absolute. Nothing can detract from it. Yet in view of the fact that Professor Humayun Kabir, Dr Tara Chand and others have been harping on the Kerala-Dravidian origin of his, it must be pointed out that tradition current on the Malabar coast asserts the importation of Brahmins from the Siwalik Hills into Kerala about the 5th or the 6th century A.D. where, it is alleged, there existed none before.<sup>64</sup> It is therefore not at all improbable that Shankaracharya's origin was Indo-Aryan and that the thought-ferment that took place in Kerala about the 8th century of the Christian era was the result of the impetus that Keralian society received through the Brahmanic importation.

<sup>64</sup> W. Logan, *Malabar*.

## CHAPTER

### 6

## INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE : THREE VIEWS (II)

SHANKARACHARYA'S work in formulating monistic philosophy and accommodating it to the work-a-day life as well as in organizing centres for furthering and stabilizing it among the people is thus seen to require no postulation of foreign influence.

We shall next turn to the contention of Dr Tara Chand and others of his way of thinking that the emotional pattern of "bhakti", somehow owes its inspiration to Islam in India. These persons also, among other things, maintain that emotional "bhakti" first makes its appearance among Tamil saints who poured their hearts over the love of God in Tamil, contending, in terms of the appendix to the *Bhagavata Purana*, that "bhakti" was born in Tamilnad and after journeying over other parts of India returned to it to flourish.

Dr Tara Chand<sup>1</sup> observes:

(1) "The religion of loving devotion was apparently the least popular of the three [the religion of ritual, the religion of knowledge and the religion of loving devotion]. Besides the Bhagavadgita and the *Narayaniya* section of the Mahabharata it is hardly mentioned in the rest of the pre-Muslim sacred literature of Northern Hinduism . . . . The worship of Vishnu or *Bhagavat* and devotion to *Amitabha* and *Shiva* have an emotional tinge, but they lack the fierce glow of passion and fervour which has a tendency to run riot in wild eroticism or incoherent ecstasism."

(2) "From the eighth century to the fifteenth the South is the home of religious reform; it is there that the *Vaishnava* and *Saivite* saints start the schools of *Bhakti*, and Sankara and Ramanuja, Nimbadiya, Basava, Valla-

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 27, 84, 87-9, 93, 112-4, 115-6.

bhacharya and Madhava [Madhva] expounded their philosophical systems. From the South the impulse was transmitted to the North through Ramananda, a pupil of Ramanuja."

(3) "... the increasing emphasis on monotheism, emotional worship, self-surrender (*prapatti*) and adoration of the teacher (*Guru-bhakti*) and in addition to them laxity in the rigours of the caste system, and indifference towards mere ritual" characterize "South Indian thought from the ninth century onwards strongly point to Islamic influence."

He rejects as unlikely the derivation of these reforms from Buddhist and Jain thought and practice "for both were in their later days rigidly bound up with ceremonialism and image worship." Dr Tara Chand demurs to their derivation from the then prevailing types of Hindu religion as both the doctrines of *Prapatti* and *Guru-bhakti* had no place in them. He says:

The idea of *Prapatti* attains importance in the school of Ramanuja, where *Bhakti* is permitted to the three higher classes alone but not to *Sudras*. The last are *Prapannas*, who take refuge in God, feeling themselves poor and helpless.... And Nimbarka gave great predominance to this method of winning the grace of God. *Prapatti* is closely connected with the adoration of the teacher (*acharyabhimana-yoga*) which consists in surrendering oneself, completely to a teacher and being guided by him in everything.

Dr Tara Chand, in deriving these doctrines from Islam, finds "no insuperable difficulty in supposing that Ramanuja adopted" the doctrine of *Prapatti* "from Islam". As for *acharyabhimana-yoga*, Dr Tara Chand<sup>2</sup> derives it from Islam's Sufism through Vaishnava *alvars* and Saiva *acharyas* of the South thus:

This *Sufi* conception of the deified teacher was incorporated in mediaeval Hinduism. Anandagiri's conception of Sankara as the incarnation of Siva, the estimation of the *Alvars* and the *Acharyas* as incarnation of Vishnu or his parts, and Umapati's *Guruvada* are all assimilations to the *Sufi* type... the *acharyabhimaniyoga* of the *Artha Panchika* and Ramanuja system were loans then not from Christianity but from Islam.

Dr Tara Chand further asserts that Vaishnavism sponsored by the Imperial Guptas had been partially eclipsed in North India during the two or two and a half centuries that elapsed between the downfall of the Guptas and the rise of the Gurjara Pratiharas of Kanauj, suggesting that it was coming back to its earlier position about the third quarter of the

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 115.

9th century.<sup>4</sup> He is certain that about that time "the doctrines of *Bhakti* which were taught in the South by *Alvars* travelled to the North and gave new strength to the Vaishnava movement. The *Bhagawata Purana* was the result of these religious upheavals". This devotional religion, however, stopped with opening "the way for the spiritual emancipation of the individual" and "did not remove the chains of social slavery", though it "marked the transition from the ancient religion of works to the mediaeval religion of *Bhakti*".

Regarding the nature and extent of Islamic influence on the development of the "bhakti"-cult in the North, "Ramananda being the bridge between the *Bhakti* movement of the South and the North", Dr Tara Chand<sup>5</sup> leaves the question rather nebulous, speaking of it only in general terms. He says,

The effect of Islam upon Hindu sects in the South has been traced in a previous chapter. The movement which started there continued to develop in the North. The religious leaders in Maharashtra, Gujarat, the Panjab, Hindustan and Bengal from the fourteenth century onwards deliberately reject certain elements of ancient creeds and emphasize others and thus *attempt* to bring about an approximation between the Hindu and Muslim faiths. At the same time Muslim Sufi orders and Muslim writers and poets show a strong tendency to assimilate Hindu practices and doctrines.

And at the end of his 70-page exposition of the "bhakti"-movement in Hindustan and Panjab, briefly summarizing the results he thought were produced in the South, he observes very tamely,

In the north the same features appeared. It is hardly necessary to enter into a detailed analysis of the literature of the two schools, the one regarding Rama as the supreme deity to be adored and the other, Krisna. Ramananda and Vallabha were the founders of the two schools in the north.

About Vaishnavism or rather the "bhakti"-cult in Bengal, he<sup>5</sup> observes: "The simple faith and the democratic ideals of Islam infringed upon this society [Bengali] \* and produced a ferment which was focussed by Chaitanya" (A.D. 1485-1533). He adds: "But whether he [Chaitanya] loved the *Yavanas*" as Jadunath Sarkar points out, "or not, it is undoubted that his

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 132-4.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 137, 143, 211.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 218-9.

\* Dr Tara Chand has not a word to say about Jayadeva and his *Gita-govinda* much less about the much earlier poet-dramatist Murari and his *Anargharaghava*.

teaching was affected by the *Yavana's* ideas."

Regarding Maharashtra, which is a hard nut to crack with Dr Tara Chand's crackers of Islamic influence, Tara Chand has to leave Jñanesvara, crediting him only with "influence on the language and thought of Maharashtra".

I. Qureshi<sup>6</sup> is quite sure that "though Islam was not successful in winning the majority of the population to Islam in South India, yet it won remarkable victories in a different, unexpected and important sphere. Its impact upon the religious thought of the area was deep and profound." He asserts that of the three paths of attaining salvation in Hinduism, the third which is "bhakti-marga", the path of devotion, "*Originally was purely a popular and Dravidian tradition*". Though granting that this "path of devotion", whose "main tenet is that God's grace frees the soul from bondage, but that it is by love and devotion that His grace can be won", "finds its first exposition in the *Bhagavadgita*", its "literary expression" is "late". "In all probability", however, Qureshi assures us it "owes its origin to Dravidian influences in Hinduism". He supports his contention by pointing out that Krishna, who gives expression to it, "is the personification of the wisdom of the dark-complexioned Dravidian". The *Tirumurai*, arranged at about the beginning of the 11th century at Tanjore, begins to show the tendency to regard God as not only immanent but also transcendent and as such to have concern for the individual soul. And the Vaishnavite collection *Nalayiraprabandham* "is just as emotional". "*All this literature*" says Qureshi "*has many passages which would inspire any Muslim*".<sup>8</sup>

Qureshi picks out from Ramanuja's religio-philosophy the tenet that whereas "the elite could practice 'bhakti', the rest could resort to 'the path of self-surrender and complete trust in the preceptor', and says that it "reminds one strongly of Islam" according to which "by concentration and meditation, *muraqabah*", man "can reach the stage of the beatific vision, *Shuhud*".<sup>9</sup>

About Ramananda (b. 1300 A.D.), Qureshi says that when he joined the sect of Ramanuja "the Muslim trends present in the teachings of the South Indian teacher were absorbed by him" which "seem to have been strengthened by contacts with the Muslims".<sup>10</sup> It can be seen that Qureshi has less concern for either objectivity or scientific evidence, than Dr Tara Chand.

I shall have to make a brief statement of the rise and development of "bhakti" and the associated feature of the importance of the spiritual preceptor or "guru". I shall start with the statement that one's "acharya", pre-

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 19-20. Italics mine. Mark Qureshi's use of the word "majority".

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26. Italics mine.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 27-8, 109.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 109.

ceptor or the grantor of knowledge, the "guru" of later phraseology, is affirmed to be the only person who can bring perfection, enlightenment or release, in one of the two oldest *Upanishads*, *Chhandogya* (IV, 9, 3, and IV, 14, 1). In the first passage we have the declaration of Satyakama, the pupil, who had completed his formal course of studies but had not yet received the final benedictory touches from his preceptor, Haridrumata Gautama, that the knowledge gained from or blessed by the preceptor alone leads to the desired end. The other passage occurs as the end of a tale of an earnest student of spiritual knowledge who he had put in hard work in his pursuit for full twelve years. A student, by name Upakosala Kamalayana, resided for 12 years with Satyakama Jabala, a well-known preceptor of Brahma-knowledge, conscientiously doing all that was expected of him to such an extent that the preceptor's wife was highly impressed by his earnestness and devotion and was distressed to see him denied the final benedictory touches by her husband. She pleaded with him in vain to do the needful and to discharge the pupil fully equipped. The "fires" of the preceptor, which Upakosala was tending, took compassion on him and taught him the esoteric lore one by one and said: "O, Upakosala, so far we have revealed to you the Brahma-lore and we can go no further. For it is only the preceptor, 'acharya', who can make it actively useful ('gati')". When Satyakama discovered this he was melted to pity and revealed to Upakosala the appropriate esoteric key and discharged him. Thus the basic notion that esoteric and spiritual knowledge can be given only by one's preceptor and by no one else, however competent in the field, and that such a gift or boon by the preceptor was entirely within the domain of his sweet will, which may not be amenable even to the pleading of his wife, is an ancient notion in Hindu culture traceable to a time anterior to Muhammad's birth at least by thirteen centuries and even to Buddha's birth by two to three centuries! And that is why we have in the *Taittiriya Upanishad* (I, 11, 2), which is later than the *Chhandogya* and yet pre-Buddhist, in the final valedictory address to the pupil, in the so-called convocation address of ancient India, the exhortation that he should treat the preceptor as if he were his God just as he should do his mother and father and his own guest.

How important a spiritual preceptor was in the age of the earliest of the *Upanishads*, the *Brihadaranyaka*, can be inferred from the fact that in this ancient and great text a complete succession of teachers and disciples is given at the end with the heading "Here is the descent", as if the teaching contained in it could not be complete without a recital of the teacher-pupil succession which developed and handed down the valuable esoteric lore.

The *Svetasvatara Upanishad*, a text, which is in large measure and in principal intent centred round Siva as the personal God, goes further on the road of the enthronement of the spiritual preceptor. It proclaims that

from the last observation about sequence. More or less as his final exhortation Lord Krishna, round whom alone the most emotional, the most erotically fervent, school of devotion came to be centred, says to Arjuna, who was by then chastened enough to receive the doctrine of the path of devotion with unquestioning mind and to appropriate it as a cherished way of liberation:

When a person having attained through the path of knowledge that equanimity of mind which enables him to look upon all with calm equality and to stop wishing or regretting, he acquires the highest devotion "para bhakti" to Me. With is devotion he knows Me as I am and with that knowledge enters Me, i.e., is united with Me. Depending on Me, "madhyapasraya", he engages in all activity and yet through My grace, "prasada", he attains the permanent and changeless state. You, therefore, (O, Arjuna) having resigned to me all activity mentally, i.e., all mental attachment to it, (which makes one desire success and sorry when failure ensues) and being intent on Me, "matpara", with the help of the path of knowledge be always thinking of Me, "maccitta". If you will always think of Me, "maccitta", you will get over all difficulties through My grace, "prasada"; but if through egoism, you would not listen to Me you will be (materially and spiritually) destroyed. (XVIII, 54-8).

As if this much recommendation of "bhakti", was not sufficient to gain it the adherence which the Lord thought was imperative for Arjuna's (or any other person's) salvation, Krishna goes on (XVIII, 65-71):

(O, Arjuna), fix your mind on Me, be My devotee, "bhakta", sacrifice to Me, bow down to Me. Doing this, you will certainly go to Me. I assure you this much as you are dear, "priya", to Me. Abandoning all paths of religious seeking you surrender yourself to or take refuge in, "sarana", Me; I shall free you from all sins; Do not feel sorry.

Earlier in the Bhagavadgita (18, 3) the Lord proclaims. "O, Kaunteya, son of Kunti. I promise you, my devotee never loses (in the battle of life and liberation)".

Krishna exhorts Arjuna (XVIII, 67-69):

You should never reveal this, (the doctrine of "bhakti" as revealed by Me to you) to anyone who does not perform austerities, who is not My "bhakta", who does not desire to listen to or who dislikes Me. One who expounds this highly esoteric doctrine to My devotees, "madbhakta", will show supreme devotion, "para bhakti" to Me and will undoubtedly go to Me. There can be none among men, who can do, or who does more



valuable service to Me than (such an expounder); and therefore there cannot possibly be anyone dearer to Me than him, in the future.

The above excerpt, it appears to me, must be interpreted to treat "bhakti" as the higher or the more recommended path of liberation, though "jnana" as an offshoot peeps in, and Lord's grace as the final arbiter of the attainment of liberation.

In a more or less similar tone are phrased the following occurrences of "bhakti" in a context which follows the disquisition on "kshetra" and "kshetrajna", i.e., on the philosophy of the relation between individual soul and the material body and the relation of the former and the Lord. After dealing with the above topics in the 13th chapter, in the midst of which a slightly different view of "bhakti" and "jnana", is presented, and having affirmed in verses 19 and 20 of Chapter XIV that a person, who cultivates knowledge of the proper nature of the three qualities postulated by the Sankhyas, and transcends them, attains "My state", in other words enjoys immortality, the Lord in the very last verse of the chapter speaks of the mastery over the three qualities as more or less the consequence of the highest type of unswerving devotion through service, "seva", and asserts that such a one becomes fit to attain Brahmanhood.

Earlier in the text of the *Bhagavadgita*, Krishna makes a statement which goes even further than the last in exalting "bhakti" to Vasudeva in so far as he affirms that a person who had attained knowledge, "jnana", achieves union with the Lord only when he realizes after many births that Vasudeva is all (VII, 19). Even more independently of "jnana" is "bhakti" of the later "prapatti", surrender-type enthroned in so far as it is stated (VII, 14) that only those who surrender themselves to the Lord penetrate His insuperable illusionary power in the form of the three qualities specified in the Sankhya philosophy. And at the end of the 9th chapter, dealing with the royal esoteric path (IX, 34) Lord Krishna exhorts Arjuna: "(O, Arjuna), fix your mind on Me, be My devotee, sacrifice to Me, bow down to Me. Being thus intent, 'parayana', on Me and continuing the practice You will come and join Me". The highest form of salvation is thus asserted by the Lord to be the direct result of intense, one-pointed and self-denying devotion to Him without the intermediary of any other path of liberation. One can easily recognize in this passage an early but concise declaration of the same doctrinal proposition which is made at the end of the text, with the quotation of which we started our journey on the Gita-path of devotion, half of the verse being the same as the first half of XVIII, 65.

In the context of the "Yogic" path of salvation, too, Krishna emphasizes the great efficacy of and his partiality for "bhakti". Thus he says (VI, 47): "Of all the Yogis one who with faith and his inner mind fixed on Me is devoted to Me is the best." This combination of "yoga" and "bhakti" figures

again in the Lord's assurance about the final occasion of leaving this world (VIII, 10, 13-14).

The content of the 13th chapter, referred to above and deferred for a full statement, may now be taken up as it bespeaks superiority of the path of knowledge. In the 18th verse of the chapter the Lord tells Arjuna that a devotee of the Lord, who attains knowledge about "kshetra" and "kshetrajna" briefly expounded before, achieves sameness with Him. Unless we interpret the expression "madbhava" to connote the same as "sarupata" of the later "bhakti"-complex, we have to admit that this verse generally puts proper knowledge "jnana", as later than and superior to the path of devotion. And it is not possible to interpret that expression in this way. For in the last verse of the chapter (XIII, 34) the Lord unequivocally proclaims that the kind of knowledge explained above leads the knower to the Supreme State. Nay even listening to the discourse of those who have attained such "jnana", knowledge, ensures immortality (XIII, 25). Realization of the all-pervasive nature of the Supreme, and of the non-existence of separateness of all, and of the oneness of all makes the realizer Brahman itself (XIII, 27-30). One who realizes that it is the three qualities that act and that the Reality is beyond them attains the form of the Supreme ('My') or enjoys immortality (XIV, 19-20). "Those who attain knowledge about Brahman and 'prakriti' (i.e., 'jnana' proper) attain My form and neither are they born at the time of Cosmic creation nor are they afflicted at the time of Cosmic dissolution (XIV, 2)." Again of the four types of "bhaktas" Lord Krishna singles out (VII, 17-8) "jnani", one who has attained knowledge and is "solely devoted to Me"—"ekabhakti", as dear to the Lord. He the Lord is equally dear to him the devotee. He in fact is considered by the Lord as Himself and is assured the highest salvation. Thus "jnana" or the path of knowledge is ultimately the path that secures the final triumph, though "bhakti", too, is, like "yoga" a necessary prerequisite and also perhaps an accompaniment of it (cf. X, 55).

The emphasis on "bhakti" in combination with some attitude which is couched in the terms of the path of knowledge, i.e., as some kind of "sannyasa", self-sacrifice, resignation to the will of God in later terminology, is the keynote of the path of devotion expounded in chapter XII, 'bhakti-yoga'. And the exhortation to resort to "bhakti" in these verses is couched in such terms as to leave no doubt that what is expected of the devotee is full-fledged, fervent devotion and self-surrender. Thus says Krishna (XII, 618):

I offer succour to and quickly free from the ocean of life and death all those, who having dedicated all their work to Me and being intent on Me without recourse to any other path, and having fixed their minds on Me, meditate on and are devoted to (sing praises of) Me. (O, Arjuna), fix your mind on Me, direct your intellect to Me; (for if you do this) there can

be no doubt that you will live in Me after you leave this world.

With the addition of acquisition of equanimity to accompany the attitude of resignation and capacity to withstand pairs of opposites without change, a "bhakta" or a person who has cultivated "bhakti", "bhaktiman", is declared to be dear to Lord Krishna in five more verses, at the end of the chapter (14-19), the chapter ending with the declaration that persons listening to the discourse, i.e., the doctrine expounded in the 19 preceding verses of the chapter, with faith and with mind intently resting in the Lord, being devotees, are particularly dear to Him! Thus it is not only the path of devotion which is a sure source of liberation but even listening to the doctrine, as in the declaration about efficacy of "jnana" as a path of liberation noted above is adequate to be so, though in a slightly deferred manner, i.e., through the Lord's love.

Krishna, to impress the importance of the path of devotion on the mind of Arjuna, assures him (*BhG* IX, 30) that if an ill-behaved person shows one pointed devotion to Him he should be considered to be a good man for he has started on the right path. This statement brings out the essence of later "bhakti", that an emotional approach to God by itself elevates the person so acting. In this connection it must be borne in mind what the Lord has affirmed. He tells (VII, 28) Arjuna that it is only persons of meritorious actions in their past lives that tend to show firm devotion to Him. Further Krishna drives home the extreme importance of "bhakti" by asserting that the Supreme whether as Personified Brahman or as the Cosmic Spirit can be visualized only by means of exclusively one-pointed, "ananya", devotion, "bhakti" (VIII 22 X, 54). And as the *BhG* has it Krishna not only very impressively described his Supreme Nature by enumerating the various manifestations but also enacted the scene of transfiguration, an opportunity every God-seeker is prepared to pay for very heavily, in the 11th chapter, thus giving Arjuna a vision of the Cosmic Spirit so dazzling and so baffling!

Krishna insists, like every God-thinker, that God, in this case He, as the Supreme God, neither likes nor hates any one and if He appears to show favour to His devotee, "bhakta", it is because the nature of "bhakti" is such that its practitioner dwells in God and God resides in the devotee (IX, 29). This "bhakti" which is such a potent source of spiritualization and God-attainment, Krishna affirms and assures, is not a very difficult technique or procedure or path. On the other hand, it is the easiest as Krishna points out in *Bhagavadgita* (XII, 58). For as the Lord puts it "God (Krishna) accepts anything that a devotee offers Him with mind controlled and fixed on Him and is pleased with it, may it be a leaf, a flower, a fruit or even water (IX, 26). The path of devotion is thus proclaimed by Krishna to be free from the hurdle of ritualism depending on the spirit, the mental attitude of the worshipper, and not either on his status or the parapher

nalīa of ritual worship.

The path of devotion, devotion to Krishna of course, is open to all in contradistinction to other paths. Proclaims Krishna: "O, Partha, son of Pritha, even 'vaiśya' (people of the third caste, who by then had of course come to have been denied all Vedic technique of worship, like sacrifices, knowledge and yoga), women (who had by then ceased to have the right to study Vedas), 'śudras', (members of the fourth caste who had always been denied that) and even outcastes (members of the untouchable classes characterized here as sinful breeds of man, which were in the Upanishadic language described as 'chandālayonis') if they resort to Me attain the Supreme State (after death)" (IX, 32).

References to "bhakti", "bhakta", or to the verbal form "bhaj" in the *Bhagavadgītā* often are accompanied by such adjectival qualification of the pattern of activity connoted by the words as "āyabliharini", non-swerving or non-wavering (III, 10; XIV, 26), "para", great or Supreme (XVIII, 54, 68), or "Sāryabhayena", with all heart or complete (XV, 19). The approach to God, the attitude which the devotee is expected to possess in resorting to devotion, is expressed by the verb "prapad", to resort to (IV, 11; VII, 15-16, 10-21), from which the word "prapatti" of the later "bhakti"-complex is derived, or by the noun "sarana" (seeking) refuge (XVIII, 62, 66), or by its equivalent "vyapasraya" or "asraya", shelter (VII, 29, XVIII, 56). Love as a component or accompaniment of "bhakti" is affirmed at least once as in X, 10, where the Lord assures Arjuna that He endows those worshippers of His who are lovingly, ("priti-purvaka") devoted to Him. On his part the Lord affirms that He works in the cause, spiritual and material, of His devotees with compassion, "anukampa" (X, 11; IX, 22), and that He is not only a friend, 'suhrid', of all but also a shelter, "niyasa", and 'refuge', "sarana" (V, 29, IX 18).

Krishna, after declaring to Arjuna that the latter had the privilege of seeing His Cosmic form because Krishna was pleased with him, "prasanna", (XI, 17), at the end of the 18th chapter assures Arjuna three times in terms of the later "bhakti"-complex, using the noun "prasada" which is derived from the same root that gives the participle "prasama" of the earlier reference, and means grace (XVIII, 56, 58, 62).

Thus it is seen that not only is the path of devotion an accredited way of approach to God but also it is recommended by Lord Krishna as superior to other paths, as quite an easy one, and as one open to all without distinction of sex or social status. Its content is quite clearly affirmed to be not only emotional but also of the particular variety of emotion as subsisting between friend and friend. Surrender on the part of the worshipper-devotee and grace on the part of the Lord are the obverse and reverse of the shield of "bhakti". It is, therefore, wrong to set aside the path of devotion propounded in the *Bhagavadgītā* as not of the later variety of "bhakti" and to go further afield to seek for Ramanuja's pattern of "bhakti"

in the earlier Tamil outpourings of the saints of Tamilnad.

The Tamil saints, at least those whose work is known, lived after the middle of the 6th century A.D. and must have derived their ideas of "bhakti" from the earlier Sanskritic sources. It is a wrong opinion, nay even malicious and pernicious, to hold that "bhakti" is a Dravidian Tamil gift to Indian culture. I say "pernicious" because it appears to me that at the back of such opinion lies to some extent, the intense antagonism between Aryan and Dravidian. It is seen, for example, in Professor Humayun Kabir's<sup>13</sup> assertion that Tamil had "a literature which was fairly developed before the advent of the Aryans on the Indian scene" and that "the earliest Tamil poetry is full of the hatred of the Dravidian for the Aryan invader". Professor Abid Husain<sup>14</sup> goes further and offers more specific datings, when he says that the Tamil work on grammar known as *Tolkappiyam*, which is extant, was written about 1000 B.C.

I have already quoted Pakistani Qureshi's view<sup>15</sup> that Krishna, the traditionally accepted preacher of the widely known and much liked religious-philosophical book, the *Bhagavadgita*, was a Dravidian, thus making "bhakti", not only the so-called new "bhakti"-pattern of the Nayanmar-Alvar and Ramanujya school but the whole of it from almost its first proclamation, a purely Dravidian product. Aziz Ahmad,<sup>16</sup> avoiding the use of the word Dravidian or even Tamil, speaks of the "bhakti"-movement as having had "its early development", i.e., upto the 13th century, in South India.

The truth about the supposed antiquity of even Tamil literature, pure and simple, is, as authoritatively stated by Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri,<sup>17</sup> that "there does not exist a single line of Tamil literature written before the Tamils came into contact with, and let us add, accepted with genuine appreciation, the Indo-Aryan culture of North Indian origin".

The *Bhagavadgita* has gone even further than adumbrating the path of devotion as a technique for liberation to be traversed by an individual and has affirmed the great efficacy of devotional ecstasy commonly experienced in group performances. The Lord affirms (IX, 13-14; X, 9-11) that He takes care of those devotees who remember and laud Him at all times and on all occasions and that "those devotees who communicate their lauds to others and go on instructing one another in groups, feeling happy and contented in that exercise, receive from Him the necessary spiritual help". And it is because Krishna approves of this group exercise of "bhakti" path as a very laudable and efficacious one that at the end He exhorts Arjuna that the esoteric doctrine revealed by Him to Arjuna should not be

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 62.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 20-24.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 140.

<sup>17</sup> *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, 1950, p. 43.

not be disclosed to anyone who is not properly prepared for it, and urges him to propagate it among properly equipped persons, assuring that one engaged in that activity would be a person dearest to Him (XVIII, 67-9). This group pursuit of devotional path reminds me of the "sankirtana" parties of Chaitanyite Bengal, described in literature and portrayed in representational art of that region as well as of the "varkari" troupes marching through Haveli taluka and Poona twice a year from Alandi-Dehu to Pandharpur and back, i.e., of the full-fledged "bhakti"-path in great ecstasy, short of the erotic component of the Chaitanyite and the later Vallabhante sects.<sup>18</sup>

This is not to say or suggest that some erotic element in Vaishnava, i.e., Krishna-bhakti, did not exist locally at Vrindavan-Mathura or among some sections of the country's Northern population before Nimbarka or the composition of the *Bhagavatapurana*. As a matter of fact as I have pointed out elsewhere Krishna's dalliance with "gopis" cowherdesses, and Radha was already endearingly referred to in popular literature of about 200 A.D. In Bhasa's drama *Balacharita* of about the same time we have reference to and description of a particular variety of dance in the cowherds-settlement in which Krishna-Damodara participated. And Bhasa has been claimed to have hailed from South India.<sup>19</sup> The manuscripts of his plays were found in Kerala.

In the popular Sanskrit work of pre-500 A.D., period, *Panchatantra* (I, between v. 221 and v. 222) a reference to Radha, the daughter of a cowherd as Vishnu's consort in one of his incarnations, makes it clear that the belief in Krishna's connection with Radha, a cowherdess, was then current among the people at large. Bhatta-Narayana a Kanauji dramatist, who lived and worked in Bengal about the end of the 8th and the beginning of the 9th century, refers to Krishna's dalliance with Radha and invokes it to bless his audience, a clear indication that some erotic element with Radha as the focus had come to be ingrated into the Krishna-bhakti complex even before Bhatta Narayana's time.

During the age of the Imperial Guptas, i.e., from about 350 A.D. to about 550 A.D., we come across individuals who are characterized in inscriptional records as "bhagavatas" devotees of Bhagavat, "parama bhagavata", great devotee of Bhagavat, and even "atyantabhagavatbhakta", supremely devoted to Bhagavat, particularly so among royal families and again as merely "bhagavatbhakta", devotee of Bhagavat. Three of the Emperors themselves, Chandragupta, Kumaragupta and Skandagupta are called "paramabhagavata".<sup>20</sup>

Similarly royal personages, who are Saiva in religious faith, describe themselves or are described as "Mahesvara" "atyanta mahesvara", follower of Mahesvara-devotion school, extreme follower of the same or again

<sup>18</sup> *Gods and Men*, 1962, pp. 173-74

<sup>19</sup> U. Venkatakrishna Rao in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 1958, pp. 112-3.

<sup>20</sup> D. C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 91, 265, 318, 327, 375, 397, 412-3, 446.

"atyantamahabhairavabhakta", extreme devotee of Mahabhairava, in inscriptions from about 380 A.D. to about 500 A.D.<sup>21</sup>

A reference to "bhakti" of the "bhagavata" sect, particularly interesting in the context of our discussion and of the allegation of Islamic influence on this religion of love made by Dr Tara Chand, is the one which occurs in an inscription of Simhavarmā, a Pallava King of Kanchi, written in the 6th-7th century but acknowledged by competent epigraphists to have been a record originally executed in the 5th-6th century A.D., from Guntur district.<sup>22</sup> Simhavarmā himself is characterized as a "paramabhagavata" and his grandfather Skandavarmā is described as one on whom all welfare, "kalyāna", was bestowed by the force of his devotion to Bhagavat. Thus this record is an irrefutable evidence that the "path" of devotion, to Bhagavat, i.e., to Vishnu, was not only known in the South but some of the kings were already followers of it in an emotionally tuned manner, great personal benefits having been ascribed to such devotion, before the end of the 5th century A.D. And I should remind my readers that it was precisely at about the same time that Bharavi, though a Northerner by birth, was writing his devotional song of Śiva's, praise surcharged with emotion for Kīrātā, the hero of his semi-epic poem *Kūtarjuniya*! I have, in the previous chapter, where the hymn of praise is summarised, drawn attention to relevant phrases and words significant from the point of view of "bhakti"-cult. Here I should like to note again in particular Bharavi's assertion that Śhiva is helpful and prepared to grant grace to anyone who, though not equipped with proper knowledge seeks refuge in him, the words used being "upeta" which is almost the same thing as "prapaṇṇa" of the Bhagavadgītā and other "bhakti"-texts, and "sarana" too.

Another very important piece of evidence for the existence of "bhakti"-cult of more or less of the same pattern as the later one is afforded by the mention of the standard muttering formula of the Śaiva and the Vaiṣṇava sects before the middle of the sixth century A.D. In the popular Sanskrit work, Panchatantra (I. v. 175 to v. 179) the Śhaiva muttering formula "Om namah Śivaya" is declared to be not only the proper introduction of one Śhaiva ascetic to another but also is characterized as the six-lettered incantation, initiation into which accompanied by the smearing of ashes on the body makes the subject even if he is a Chandala, of untouchable caste, Śhiva himself. It is further stated that if anyone places even one flower on phallus to the accompaniment of the utterance of this six-lettered incantation, he will never be born again. Thus the easy path of a very simple form of worship accompanied by the utterance of the formula "Om, namah Śivaya". (Om, bow to Śhiva) was considered to be adequate, like the "bhakti"-path of the *Bhagavadgītā*, to secure liberation and salvation in

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 125, 269-71, 419, 420

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 445-9.

the then current form of Saivism. In a Shinnoga district inscription<sup>23</sup> of the 3rd quarter of the 5th century the invocation, however, has only the five-lettered formula with the initial "Om" dropped out. Saiva pattern of worship, if one does not like to call it "bhakti" direct, current before the end of the 5th century was extremely simple and liberal. It had no need to copy liberalism or even love as its component from any outside source!

As for the part played by Tamil saints out of their own resources outside Indo-Aryan inspiration, it is to be borne in mind that Bharavi's hymn of praise provides enough evidence that Shaiva-devotion had already reached the South, before any of the great Tamil hymnners beginning with Appar appeared on the scene. And C. V. Narayana Ayyar has added even more significant proof of the Northern influence in the development of Tamil "bhakti"-school and pattern. Ayyar<sup>24</sup> tells us that Tirumula Narayana or simply Tirumular, the author of *Tirumandiram*, which is considered to be "one of the most authoritative works embodying Saiva doctrine", lived before Appar, and it is to be ascribed to some time before 600 A.D. and that he was a Kashmirian who had gone South.

It is specially to be noted that Tirumular<sup>25</sup> at that early age speaks of four paths, "marga", of Siva-"bhakti" which are: (1) "Sanmarga" which appears to be nothing else than "Gurumarga", the path of the spiritual preceptor. In the words of Tirumular as rendered by Ayyar "Sanmarga will of itself give *mukti* to those who see, worship and reflect upon, touch, praise and adorn their head with the feet of the Guru"; (2) *Sakhamarga*, the path of friendship; (3) *Satputra Marga*, the path of becoming a good son of God, and (4) *Dasa Marga*, the path of being a servant of God.

Not only Tirumula but also (from among the Tamil hymnners of the *Tevaram* or *Devaram*, both Appar and Sambandar) belong to the early part of the seventh century.<sup>26</sup> Thus at least these three great saints whose work influenced, nay made, South India, i.e., Tamil, Shaiva "bhakti"-pattern, could not have received any Islamic influence, having lived either before or contemporaneously with Muhammad.

So "bhakti"-school and pattern are neither in origin nor in development entirely Tamil. Much less can they have been influenced by any Islamic thought or practice, being almost wholly pre-Islamic!

So far I have followed up the trend of "bhakti"-pattern in Saivism, which was much earlier in its Tamil expression than Vaishnava "bhakti" school, though I pointed out the existence of fourth and fifth century Vaishnava "bhaktas" in the North and in the South among royal personages. It re-

<sup>23</sup> D. C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 450-1.

<sup>24</sup> *Origin and Early History of Saivism in South India*, 1936, pp. 204, 209, 211-3, 253, 275.

<sup>25</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 260-1

<sup>26</sup> J. N. Farquhar, *Op. cit.*, p. 196. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, *Op. cit.*, I, pp. 531, 577; II, p. 802.



mains for me to round up the history in the same manner as I have done for Shaiva "bhakti" school, which I do by mentioning the clear and unequivocal record of the twelve-lettered "mantra", incantation, of the Vaishnavas believed to have been popularized by Ramanuja is the twelfth century. That "mantra" is exactly parallel to that of the Shaivas and reads, "Om, namo bhagavate Vasudevaya", Om, bow to majestic Vasudeva. The formula occurs at the beginning of a copperplate inscription from Koh in Nagaudh district, dated 529 A.D. only with the omission of the word "Om", whose place in the practice of those days was taken by a symbol for "Siddham".<sup>27</sup>

The old tradition about preceptor, "guru", and his significance in the process of gaining knowledge, whether secular or spiritual, has already been noted. It is possible to cite examples of such regard and reverence being shown by disciples from Epic stories but it is not necessary. I have quoted above Kalidasa's description of Siva as the "guru" of the three worlds. It will be granted that the idea of "jagadguru", preceptor of the world, was not brand new when it came to be applied to Shankaracharya. As for his being regarded as an incarnation of Siva, I have now to bring to the notice of the readers that that idea, too, was a few centuries old when used in his behalf.

R. G. Bhandarkar<sup>28</sup> mentioned more than half a century ago that in an inscription in a temple near Udaipur, Rajasthan, dated 971 A.D., "it is stated that Siva became incarnate as a man with a club (lakula) [this refers to Lakulisa or Lakulin who is generally considered<sup>29</sup> to have lived in Gujarat about 200 A.D.] in his hand in the country of Bhigukaccha". He also drew attention to the fact that the earliest Purana, the *Vayu Purana*, before 560<sup>30</sup> A.D., state that Mahesvara promised Brahma that he would incarnate himself as Lakulin at Kayavrohana when Vasudeva (Krishna) would be born. J. N. Farquhar<sup>31</sup> too, writing in 1920, drawing upon later researches, particularly of D. R. Bhandarkar in this behalf, and not agreeing with the latter about the date of Lakulin being the first century A.D., says: "It thus seems likely that the sect /Lakulisa-Pasupata/ was founded by a Pasupata ascetic named Lakulin, i.e., the club-bearer, who taught a form of Pasupata doctrine, and was recognized as an incarnation of Siva . . . it is likely that the sect arose . . . perhaps about the third or fourth century."

More or less contemporaneous with Lakulin in its reference is the temple of "guru" which is registered in a Mathura inscription<sup>32</sup> of 380 A.D. The

<sup>27</sup> D. C. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 374.

<sup>28</sup> *Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems*, 1913, p. 116; *my Gods and Men*, p. 26.

<sup>29</sup> See *my Gods and Men*, p. 26.

<sup>30</sup> Patil, *Cultural History from the Vayu Purana*, p. 4.

<sup>31</sup> *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, pp. 146-7.

<sup>32</sup> D. C. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-71.

the then current form of Saivism. In a Shimoga district inscription<sup>23</sup> of the 3rd quarter of the 5th century the invocation, however, has only the five-lettered formula with the initial "Om" dropped out. Saiva pattern of worship, if one does not like to call it "bhakti" direct, current before the end of the 5th century was extremely simple and liberal. It had no need to copy liberalism or even love as its component from any outside source!

As for the part played by Tamil saints out of their own resources outside Indo-Aryan inspiration, it is to be borne in mind that Bharavi's hymn of praise provides enough evidence that Shaiva-devotion had already reached the South, before any of the great Tamil hymnners beginning with Appar appeared on the scene. And C. V. Narayana Ayyar has added even more significant proof of the Northern influence in the development of Tamil "bhakti"-school and pattern. Ayyar<sup>24</sup> tells us that Tirumula Narayana or simply Tirumular, the author of *Tirumandiram*, which is considered to be "one of the most authoritative works embodying Saiva doctrine", lived before Appar, and it is to be ascribed to some time before 600 A.D. and that he was a Kashmirian who had gone South.

It is specially to be noted that Tirumular<sup>25</sup> at that early age speaks of four paths, "marga", of Siva-"bhakti" which are: (1) "Sanmarga" which appears to be nothing else than "Gurumarga", the path of the spiritual preceptor. In the words of Tirumular as rendered by Ayyar "*Sanmarga* will of itself give *mukti* to those who see, worship and reflect upon, touch, praise and adorn their head with the feet of the Guru"; (2) *Sakhamarga*, the path of friendship; (3) *Satputra Marga*, the path of becoming a good son of God, and (4) *Dasa Marga*, the path of being a servant of God.

Not only Tirumular but also (from among the Tamil hymnners of the *Tevaram* or *Devaram*, both Appar and Sambandar) belong to the early part of the seventh century.<sup>26</sup> Thus at least these three great saints whose work influenced, nay made, South India, i.e., Tamil, Shaiva "bhakti"-pattern, could not have received any Islamic influence, having lived either before or contemporaneously with Muhammad.

So "bhakti"-school and pattern are neither in origin nor in development entirely Tamil. Much less can they have been influenced by any Islamic thought or practice, being almost wholly pre-Islamic!

So far I have followed up the trend of "bhakti"-pattern in Saivism, which was much earlier in its Tamil expression than Vaishnava "bhakti" school, though I pointed out the existence of fourth and fifth century Vaishnava "bhaktas" in the North and in the South among royal personages. It re-

<sup>23</sup> D. C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 450-1.

<sup>24</sup> *Origin and Early History of Saivism in South India*, 1936, pp. 204, 209, 211-3, 253, 275.

<sup>25</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 260-1.

<sup>26</sup> J. N. Faquhar, *Op. cit.*, p. 196. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar, *Op. cit.*, I, pp. 521, 577; II, p. 802.

mains for me to round up the history in the same manner as I have done for Shaiva "bhakti" school, which I do by mentioning the clear and unequivocal record of the twelve-lettered "mantra", incantation, of the Vaishnavas believed to have been popularized by Ramanuja is the twelfth century. That "mantra" is exactly parallel to that of the Shaivas and reads, "Om, namo bhagavate Vasudevaya", Om, bow to majestic Vasudeva. The formula occurs at the beginning of a copperplate inscription from Koh in Nagaulh district, dated 529 A.D. only with the omission of the word "Om", whose place in the practice of those days was taken by a symbol for "Siddham".<sup>27</sup>

The old tradition about preceptor, "guru", and his significance in the process of gaining knowledge, whether secular or spiritual, has already been noted. It is possible to cite examples of such regard and reverence being shown by disciples from Epic stories but it is not necessary. I have quoted above Kalidasa's description of Siva as the "guru" of the three worlds. It will be granted that the idea of "jagadguru", preceptor of the world, was not brand new when it came to be applied to Shankaracharya. As for his being regarded as an incarnation of Siva, I have now to bring to the notice of the readers that that idea, too, was a few centuries old when used in his behalf.

R. G. Bhandarkar<sup>28</sup> mentioned more than half a century ago that in an inscription in a temple near Udaipur, Rajasthan, dated 971 A.D., "it is stated that Siva became incarnate as a man with a club (lakula) [this refers to Lakulisa or Lakulin who is generally considered<sup>29</sup> to have lived in Gujarat about 200 A.D./ in his hand in the country of Bhigukaccha". He also drew attention to the fact that the earliest Purana, the *Vayu Purana*, before 500<sup>30</sup> A.D., state that Mahesvara promised Brahma that he would incarnate himself as Lakulin at Kayavarohana when Vasudeva (Krishna) would be born. J. N. Farquhar<sup>31</sup> too, writing in 1920, drawing upon later researches, particularly of D. R. Bhandarkar in this behalf, and not agreeing with the latter about the date of Lakulin being the first century A.D., says: "It thus seems likely that the sect /Lakulisa-Pasupata/ was founded by a Pasupata ascetic named Lakulin, i.e., the club-bearer, who taught a form of Pasupata doctrine, and was recognized as an incarnation of Siva . . . it is likely that the sect arose . . . perhaps about the third or fourth century."

More or less contemporaneous with Lakulin in its reference is the temple of "guru" which is registered in a Mathura inscription<sup>32</sup> of 380 A.D. The

<sup>27</sup> D. C. Sircar, *op. cit.*, p. 374.

<sup>28</sup> *Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems*, 1913, p. 116; *my Gods and Men*, p. 26.

<sup>29</sup> See *my Gods and Men*, p. 26.

<sup>30</sup> Patil, *Cultural History from the Vayu Purana*, p. 4.

<sup>31</sup> *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, pp. 146-7.

<sup>32</sup> D. C. Sircar, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-71.

record states, with an appeal to Mahesvara, followers of the devotional school called Mahesvara, that two images of spiritual preceptors, evidently of the Mahesvara sect, Kapila-vimala and his disciple Upamita-vimala, with phallus on their heads and hence named Kapilesvara and Upamitesvara respectively, were set up in a temple apparently built to accommodate them. The inscription refers to two of the predecessors of His Holiness or His Divinity Kapila-vimala in the preceptorial succession, viz., His Divinity Kusika, who is stated to be the 9th in ascent from the disciple-donor or institutor of the images under reference, and His Divinity Parasara who was the third in ascent. This record then establishes the fact that preceptors were canonized and idolized in the Mahesvara school of devotional Saivism actually by 350 A.D. and probably as early as 200 A.D. Surely idolization of religious preceptors was thus five centuries old before Shankaracharya was born.

Within Vaishnavism, I think, it is enough to note that the Ramanuja school in raising "guru" to the high level only carried forward the doctrine, manifest or implicit in Arjuna's reference to Krishna in His Cosmic form as the "guru" of "gurus", the spiritual preceptor *par excellence* *Bhagavad-gita* (XI, 43).

There is thus no justification for ascribing any share to Islamic influence either in the philosophy, the missionary zeal or the organizational technique Shankaracharya. The history of the rise and development of emotional and fervent devotionism being what is stated above, there is no need to call in the aid of any foreign thought and practice to account for the rise and growth of the Ramanuja school of Vaishnava "bhakti" and its reverence for spiritual preceptors.

The Indian writers, Tara Chand, Humayun Kabir, and Abid Husain, on the one hand, and the Pakistani writers, Ishtaq Qureshi and to some extent Aziz Ahmad, have postulated Islamic influence in the manner and in the sphere of Indian thought and practice in which they have done it, in order to show how Islam in India has been beneficial to Hindu thought and culture. To the Indian writers, however, this is only one side of the shield. As we go along, we can see the other side being formed by the absorption of some Hindu items of culture by Islam in India. And the two processes and their products together are used by them to demonstrate the coming together of and the rapprochement between the Hindu and the Islamic components of Indian culture to form what Professor Abid S. Husain calls Hindustani culture.

Dr Tara Chand has devoted four fifths of his book to the statement and discussion of religious thought and practice with a view to bringing out not only points of similarity but also mostly the features and aspects, which received, according to him, the strongest Islamic impress. In the remaining one-fifth of his book, less than 50 pages, he has attempted to prove that Indian architecture and Indian painting profited by the Islamic impact

and were regenerated through it.

In the only small paragraph, which Dr Tara Chand has devoted to the growing synthesis or developing rapprochement in customs and manners between the two cultures, trying, to use an expression which Dr Tara Chand would have liked to employ, to coalesce into one (?), he says<sup>31</sup>:

It is hardly possible to exaggerate the extent of Muslim influence over Indian life in all departments. But nowhere else is it shown so vividly and so picturesquely, as in customs, in intimate details of domestic life, in music [This appears to be his only reference to the mutuality of influence in this emotionally important field of activity!], in the fashions of dress, in the ways of cooking, in the ceremonials of marriage, in the celebration of festivals and fairs and in the courtly institutions and etiquette of Maratha, Rajput and Sikh princes. *In the days of Babur the Hindu and Muslim lived and thought so much alike that he was forced to notice their peculiar Hindustani way*; his successors so gloriously adorned and so marvellously enriched his legacy that India might well be proud to-day of the heritage which they in their turn have left behind.

Professor Humayun Kabir calls the rapprochement 'mediaeval reconciliation' dividing it into three aspects: (1) The Hindustani \* way; (2) Economics and Art, and (3) Modes of Outlook, devoting almost equal space to each (only the second aspect getting two pages more than either of the other two).

Kabir<sup>32</sup> observes.

It was not on the spiritual plane alone that there were attempts at co-operative activity. At first under the Pathans and later on a wider scale under the Mughals, this is unmistakable in the evolution of customs and conduct, fashions and festivals in the very preparation of food and in social and household affairs. In the matter of dress, a new costume was evolved which makes a breakaway from Arab or Central Asian influence. *This period also saw the growth of a new language which serves to this day as a medium of communication between Indians of different races and regions*. . . . In every sphere of social, political and cultural life we find the same impulse of fusion and synthesis.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 141-2. Italics mine.

\* It may be noted that Kabir uses the Hindu-Sanskritic form with 'th' in 'Hindustan' while the Aligarh Professor, Abid Husan, both in *The National Culture of India* and in his brochure *Indian Culture*, in the General Education series of the Aligarh Muslim University, uses the non-Hindu-Sanskritic 't' in it instead of 'th'.

<sup>32</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 81-2 Italics mine.

<sup>33</sup> Pp. 137-142 (2nd Ed.), 1966.

In my *Indian Costume* (1951) I had suggested from the evidence stated there and drawn from Blochet's *Musulman Painting* and *Baburnama* (Memoirs of Babur) that the dress of Muslim females of North India from about 1200 A.D. to 1800 A.D. was distinct from that of the Hindu females of that part. To the data and arguments presented there I now add the strengthening support of the painstaking researches of K. M. Ashraf<sup>36</sup> in Persian and Urdu sources for the socio-political history of Mediaeval India.

Ashraf describes the official dress of noblemen as consisting of "a *Kulah* for head dress, a tunic worked in brocade and velvet and a white belt . . . In private, the nobles usually wore the short Hindu turban (*pag*), a tunic of some fine texture and the ordinary shirt and drawers. Underwear of muslin or of some fine material was used . . . the Muslim aristocracy of Bengal wore the usual small turban of white cloth, a long tunic with a collar, pointed leather shoes, a broad and coloured waist-band and the usual shirt and drawers. At other times they used a decagonal cap as head-dress. In Gujarat, where Moorish influence prevailed, heavy Moorish turbans and loose drawers, long shoes of leather going up to the knees and finger-rings were popular." "Coming to Hindu dresses", says Ashraf, "we have already remarked that the *Hindu turban* was becoming popular among Muslims of the upper classes. The Indian aristocracy, as a rule [the Kayasthas in particular and the Khatri to some extent], followed the Muslim nobility in their dresses . . . Among other general features of Hindu dressing, people usually went bare-headed and bare-footed. A dhoti or a single sheet of long cloth below the waist was a sufficient and respectable dress."

After describing one variety of female dress as consisting of "chadara", "sari" and "chola" i.e., "choli", a bodice with short sleeves, with the addition of "angiya"—I doubt the correctness of this assertion. For as I have suggested in my *Indian Costume*, "angiva" in all probability was "choli" with longer sleeves and the other as consisting of "lahanga" with "chola" and "angiva" with the addition of a *rupatia* ["dupatta"?]. Ashraf speaks of the dress of Muslim ladies in the next sentence thus: "Muslim ladies of the upper classes usually wore loose drawers, a shirt [*khamise*?] and a long scarf, together with the usual veil or shroud. *These features of female dress are still more or less prevalent in Hindustan.*" I should add here that the so-called shirt or "khamise" is a piece that reached the knee-cap and thus formed a double covering for the part of the body from the lower abdomen to the knee and that there must have been a sort of a "choli" worn underneath it over the breasts. The veil or shroud was a tailored piece of apparel, depending from over the head down to the ankles, with an appropriate arrangement like that of the European dressing gown to hold it tight at the waist. In a footnote (p. 279) Ashraf has added what is from our present viewpoint a very significant remark, "Compare *how recently the Muslim*

<sup>36</sup> *Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustan (1200-1550)*, 1935, pp. 275-6. Italics mine.

*drawers have been adopted by Hindu women in the Punjab*".\*

The fact of Muslim dress having been quite distinct from Hindu dress down to the time of Guru Nanak (1469-1539) is further established by the following observation of Ashraf (p. 278): "He [Nanak] is reported in Sikh tradition to have himself used a number of combinations of *Hindu and Muslim dresses*, without really succeeding in harmonizing *the various distinctive features of each*."

Dr Yasin's researches on the later Moghul period, 1605-1748, as painstaking as those of Ashraf on the earlier period, complete the picture of distinctness of Muslim dress, even though his general integrational attitude leads him into making some remarks and observations, as if they were ascertained facts, counteracting such a view.

In the male dress, the speciality of the "angarkha" or the long-coat-like garment worn by the Hindus was that it was fastened by them on the left, whereas the Muslim coat had its tie on the right side of the chest, and, as was pointed out by me in my *Indian Costume*, it continued to be so fastened in spite of Akbar's injunction that the Hindus, too, should have the tie on the right side. Dr Yasin<sup>37</sup> confirms the fact of this distinction. For the head-dress the Muslims had either a turban or *Kulah*, a tall Tartar cap. The Shia Muslims bedecked their heads with a scarlet cap, either seven-pointed or twelve-pointed according to the sub-sect to which the wearer belonged. "In private the Muslims usually used *Lungis* (loin cloth)—this translation in so far as it may create the false impression of its having been a squarish small piece of cloth, which has been used by lower classes of Hindus, covering just the privities with one end drawn tight through the divide of the buttocks back and tucked in there and the other end spread out in a triangular form in front, is not correct. It resembled the 'mundu' of South Indians in form and wear but differed from it in being coloured or variegated *in imitation of the Arabs to be wrapped round their bodies as early as the time of Muhammad Tughlaq if not earlier in Hindustan*. . . . The women in general wore close-fitting trousers, shirts and a long scarf. . . . Some women also used a thin cap for the covering of their heads."

About food the true story is equally opposed to the pleasant supposition of Tara Choud and Kabir. It is a notorious fact visible to any passerby that "*chapati*", bread, the basic item of a full meal in Northern India, is differently made by the two communities, for the Muslim way of preparing it can be seen, as in many small Muslim eating-houses the operation is carried out at the entrance on the outside. What to speak of meat which did not form a part of the menu of a large number of Hindu castes in the north! And here is the testimony of both Ashraf and Yasin for the whole Muslim period of Indian history.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>37</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 38-40, Italics mine.

Ashraf<sup>35</sup> observes:

For the breakfast in the morning, the Hindus usually took *khichri* or boiled rice and pulses. The Muslims preferred to eat fried bread and *kababs*. The ordinary Muslim meal consisted of wheat bread, fried bread, and chicken. Hindus, as a rule, were vegetarians. . . . One feature of social life which has comparatively gone out of use, was the number of public bakeries, where almost every variety of cooked food and uncooked victuals could be bought at a reasonable price. *This was, however, in general opposed to the Hindu ideas of cooking and eating.*

For the later Moghul, post-Akbar, period Dr Yasin<sup>36</sup> vouchsafes that the Muslims were notoriously fastidious in taste in the matter of diet.

Beef, though not looked upon with favour by the aristocracy, was the common sustenance of an ordinary Muslim. The meat-preparations, especially *Kababs* and *Sambosas*, were much relished. *Pulao* and *dampokht* fowls were the specialities. . . . *Baqur Khani* also called *Bughra Khani*, a kind of crisp bread and *Faludah*, "a jelly strained from boiled wheat, and eaten with the expressed juice of fruits and ice, to which cream also is sometimes added", were the other favourite foods.

As for common manner of marriage celebration one may point out quite a number of similarities in some of these rites from other peoples from outside India. And as a fair number, the larger part of the Muslim population of India were Hindu converts or their descendants, it is but natural to expect a number of survivals which did not particularly go against Islamic marriage regulations.

Regarding common festivals it has to be pointed out that some participation by Muslims in one or two of the Hindu festivals which number nearly two dozen or by Hindus in a more enthusiastic manner in that of the Muslim Muharram does not establish mutual participation in each other's festivals by the two communities.

Ashraf<sup>37</sup> in the following observation has brought out the essential difference in the festivals and the manner of celebrating them in the two communities: "In comparison with the Muslim festivals, the religious and social festivals of the Hindus are to be noted for the manner of their celebration and the appropriate seasons in which they occur. . . . *Speaking from the orthodox viewpoint, Muslim life as a whole has little room for any kind of social festivals.*" The common participation of Muslims in two or three Hindu festivals was mostly during Akbar's integrative activity and

<sup>35</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 283. Italics mine.

<sup>36</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 36-7.

<sup>37</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 297, 300. Italics mine.



the Hindus joining in the Muharram is attested in the Deccan under the Bahamanis.<sup>41</sup> In Northern India, the celebration of the Muharram has been attested as a scarecrow for the Hindus. The feelings between Shias and Sunnis on the occasion ran high but the Hindus were the actual scapegoats as the supposed murderers of Imam Husain. Peter Mundy,<sup>42</sup> about the middle of the 17th century, writes (II, 219). "And this they (i.e., Muslims) do with so much fury and animosity, that should there be any of the Pagans (i.e., Hindus) in the Streets at the time, they would run the hazard of their lives: whence it comes, that *during these ceremonies (of Muharram), they (the Hindus) stir not out of their houses.*"

Further and conclusive proof of the separateness of the two communities and their non-integration is afforded by the localization of communities in the then cities. Ashraf<sup>43</sup> observes about it: "The rest of the population divided itself into religious, racial and even occupational groups. For instance, Muslims and Hindus had separate quarters." And Dr Yusuf Husain's final appraisal of the social situation appears to me to be amply borne by the facts I have laid out above. He<sup>44</sup> says:

Although there were many points of contact between Hindus and Muslims on the higher as well as on the lower levels, their life currents flowed separately. Historically we have to admit that Indian society in mediaeval times was distinctly divided between the Hindus and the Muslims, whose spiritual sources of inspiration were different, although on the material and outwardly plane they had many things in common.

The phenomenon thus very moderately and rather mildly worded, is represented by some of the Pakistani writers in a much more lurid light. Thus the most balanced writer amongst them, Aziz Ahmad, instead of seeing any rapprochement of the two communities through the medium of Islamic Sufism and Indian Bhakti, concludes:<sup>45</sup> "In Islamic religious history the *tension* between the religious assertion of the transcendence of God and the mystical aspiration for His immanence was perhaps nowhere more thoroughly resolved to a middle of the road position than in *India where Islam was propagated mainly by Sufis with a firm emphasis on the observance of the tenets of the sharia*". Further after dealing with Kabir and other syncretic schools as well as syncretic sects of Sufis, Ahmad remarks: "In the nineteenth century most of these sects collapsed before the assault of Hindu and Muslim reformist and fundamentalist movements and took

<sup>41</sup> Yasin, *op. cit.*, pp. 52, 91.

<sup>42</sup> As quoted by Yasin, *Ibid.*, note 16, p. 57. *Italics mine.* Yasin gives a reference to another traveller's account (Mandelslo, p. 42)

<sup>43</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 268.

<sup>44</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 126.

<sup>45</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 131, 163. *Italics mine.*

to orthodoxy in one religion or the other."

This phenomenon of an invading and a conquering people establishing their rule for sometime in India over the then indigenous population was not a new one in the country. Four or five such occurrences, after the cessation of the Persian dominion over the North-western part of the country, are known from history. But in every case, whether the foreign rule lasted for fifty years or one hundred fifty years, the rulers were assimilated and incorporated in the Indian-Hindu society and had ceased to be foreigners with a different faith from those of the local population. But with the Muslims things turned out to be very different. With their faith very positive and rigid, their sword sharp and hard, and their proselytization, whether forcible, lucrative or persuasive, the Muslims could not only be not attempted to be assimilated by the local Indians but had to be guarded against to see that the local Indians did not vanish into the great surge of Islamization.

Here then is presented to a sociologist or a culturologist a phenomenon of first rate significance to study the reaction of the two units as sides to the situation.

The situation was one of not only tension but of very active and repeated conflict, at least, between the Muslim dynasties or ruling houses and a number of the Rajput ruling families, till about the middle of the 16th century in Northern India. Attempts have been made at times to represent this struggle as non-communal and purely dynastic, with both Hindus and Muslims helping both sides to the conflict. But in the struggle and conflicts before the middle of the 16th century barring the episode of doubtful validity in the conflict of Allauddin Khilji and Rana Hammira of Mewad, there is no evidence of such alignment in other conflicts.

And there is literary evidence for the communal conflict. As Aziz Ahmad has pointed out the bardic poetry of Rajasthan which had for its theme, in the four or five centuries of its existence till the twelfth century, the valour of one Rajput hero against another, had later become "the chief vehicle of resistance to the Muslim conquest". And his further contention that the tradition faded with "the firm establishment of Muslim power" is contradicted by his own mention of Hindu "so-called epics" which were in his view only the counter epics to the Persian epics of Muslim conquest like Amir Khusrau's (1255-1325) *Miftah-al-futuh*.<sup>46</sup>

The lineage of Mewad, that of Rana Hammira, was the one that kept up its opposition to the Muslim suzerainty till the death of Rana Pratap, the great patriot, who in the reckoning of all nationalist Indians must begin the list of great patriots fighting for freedom of this land.

In the South, though the peaceful settlement of Muslim colonies down the southernmost part of the country were the earliest, where local con-

<sup>46</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 239; *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 1963, pp. 470-76.

versions must have taken place much earlier than in the North, the Muslim power penetrated only at about the end of the first quarter of the 14th century, and the conflict between Hindu and Muslim rulers began almost immediately after the establishment of a Muslim principality in the Deccan.<sup>47</sup> Muhammad Shah I, Muslim monarch of Gulbarga, began his expansionist conquests and came to a clash with the kingdom of Vijayanagara in A.D. 1367 and defeating its king exacted a humiliating tribute. In the course of the operations the Muslim monarch, in retaliation for acts of sacrilege perpetrated by the Vijayanagara monarch, massacred no less than 4,00,000 Hindus including 10,000 Brahmins.<sup>48</sup> This started a feud between the Muslim powers—for the Gulbarga kingdom was soon broken up into five monarchies—and the Kings of Vijayanagara. Vijayanagara sometimes sided with one of the five in their rivalry not because it had love for Muslims but evidently to gain its own objective. And the finale of this feud bears testimony to the intensely communal nature of the conflict, though there might have been petty instances of a non-communal and mixed nature.

The battle of Talikot in 1565 in which the large Vijayanagara army suffered a complete defeat at the hands of the combined armies of the four chief Muslim powers, which buried their quarrels for the while in order to finish the common foe, ending the glories of Vijayanagara and of Hindu people in the South, is itself a testimony to the communal participation, or rather worse, communal virus. The traveller Caesar Frederick informs posterity of the treachery of two Muslim generals of Vijayanagara, each of whom had under him an army of seventy thousand.<sup>49</sup>

The glories of Vijayanagara, i.e., the magnificence and greatness of the city were such during the 15th century that they have been unstintedly sung by foreigners including even the Muslim, Abdur-Razzaq. Vijayanagara, as pointed out by me in my *Cities and Civilization*, was the unofficial metropolis of India of those days and not Delhi, though the rich Muslim monarchs had lavished the country's wealth in erecting mosques and mausoleums there. The great artistic achievement of the kingdom and its people was attested in the temples of the region dating from the 13th century to the downfall of the kingdom. No less a student of art and architecture than James Fergusson<sup>50</sup> has testified to it. And yet this, Vijayanagara and its achievements, perhaps the greatest glory of Mediaeval India of pre-Moghul times, which excited the admiration of foreigners and left them wondering, does not find a mention in any of the three books on Indian

<sup>47</sup> N. Venkataramanavaya, *The Early Muslim Expansion in South India*, 1942, pp. 22, 49, 163-91.

<sup>48</sup> *The Cambridge Shorter History of India*, p. 280.

<sup>49</sup> S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, *Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture*, I, p. 200; G. H. Mehri in his unpublished thesis, has quoted Caesar Frederick at length, pp. 57-8.

<sup>50</sup> *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, Vol. 1, pp. 400-04.

culture or National Indian culture by Humayun Kabir and Professor S. Abid Husain!

Professor Kabir's justification for not mentioning Vijayanagara may be that he was only interested in showing Islamic influence, real or fancied, on Hindu thought and art of living, and that he went South only to pick up whatever he thought reflected Islamic influence, whether in Shankaracharya or Ramanujacharya. If he brings in the temples of the South in his treatment of what he calls "spirit of harmony and fusion of styles" in architecture of the North it is only to substantiate his thesis.

This reasoning or any other cannot explain or justify Professor Husain's studied omission of any reference to Vijayanagara in his book, even in its second edition, *National Culture of India*. For he has not only devoted a whole paragraph to the Bahamani kingdoms of the Deccan but has also sung their praises which do not stand the test of scholarship. Stating that the five Bahamani kingdoms were liberal in their policy towards Hindus he remarks (p. 96): "They were patrons of the local languages and some of them were good Marathi and Urdu poets". In suppressing their animosity towards and hatred of the Hindu prosperous kingdom of Vijayanagara which by the combined efforts of the four of them was finally destroyed, Husain has not done well by historic truth. To suppress truth is doing disservice both to history and to national solidarity. For any apparent solid front which is based on misguidance cracks when the truth is out, as sooner or later it will be.

Professor Husain in asserting that the Bahamani kings patronized local languages and that some of them wrote Marathi poetry has unwittingly sponsored a falsehood almost as patent as any falsehood. Those who have studied the history Marathi literature, flatly contradict Husain's appraisal. Thus Professor G. B. Nirantar<sup>51</sup> is so far convinced of the devastating and blasting effect of the rise of the Bahamani kingdom about 1350 A.D. on Marathi literature, whose greatest poetic masterpiece, *Jnaneshvari*, was produced about fifty years before the advent of these kingdoms in the region which later became their component part, that he describes the period of A.D. 1350 to 1490 as "Asmani-Sultani", i.e., as one of natural and Muslim-produced calamities. The fact is that there was a great famine in the Deccan in the latter part of the 14th century which was the natural calamity affecting the production of Marathi literature. And the Muslim rulers, Sultans or absolute monarchs and terrorizers, created the other calamity, the one produced by Muslims. He tells us that there is hardly a piece of poetry or prose coming from that period. And the first of the Muslim poets composing his outpourings in Marathi according to Nirantar's account came in the beginning of the 17th century. Most of the poets were "bhaktas" of the well-known "varkari"-type, i.e., Muslims in name but devotees of

<sup>51</sup> *Marathi Vangamayacha Paramarsa* (in Marathi, 3rd Ed., 1964), p. 121.

Vithoba of Pandharpur in reality.

Professor Abid Husain in repeating almost verbatim his assertions about the Bahamani "Empire" in the Deccan with the slight change from "Urdu" to "Dakhni", shaping the assertion for easier and prompter acceptance of the ultra-liberality of the Bahamani monarchs, in his General Education project of the Aligarh Muslim University, in the brochure *Indian Culture* (p. 35), has not served well the cause either of general education or of Indian solidarity by suppressing all reference to Vijayanagara Kingdom destroyed by the Bahamanis, and to its predecessor, the Hoysala kingdom, destroyed by the Northern Khiljis.

Dr Yusuf Husain's<sup>52</sup> frank statement about the role of the Deccan kingdoms of Bijapur and Golconda in the development of and in their actual contribution to Urdu demonstrates the incorrectness of Professor Abid Husain's rather camouflaged assertion about them. Informing us that the Adil Shahi kings of Bijapur were "great patrons of art and poetry" he specifies the three Muslim Urdu poets who were patronized by the court. He adds that Ibrahim Adil Shah II "was called Jagat Guru [by whom?] on account of his mastery of Indian music. He wrote the famous work on Indian music called *Nautas*". It was he who "made the Deccani Urdu" his court-language supplanting Persian. Dr Husain thus expands the rather laconic statement of Professor Husain and exposes it in its true colours, and adds the interesting detail that "the most famous poet of the period", of course of Urdu poetry, "Mulla Nusrati flourished at Bijapur". I. Qureshi<sup>53</sup> of Pakistan, however, speaks of Muhammad Qutb Shah (1611-1625 A.D.) of Golconda as the best known of the Urdu poets of the Deccan. Dr Husain speaks of Qutb Shah as "A poet of great merit" and of two other Golconda kings, his successors, as having written "poetry in the Deccani style".\* Thus Professor Abid Husain's claim that the Bijapur or Golconda Muslim kings encouraged local Marathi and much more his assertion of one of them having written Marathi poetry are flatly contradicted. As regards Dr Husain's assertion about the book on music, which I take it must have been in Urdu, it does not find positive support in any history of music I have consulted.

It is not right either to suppress or to distort the facts of history which sooner or later will come to the knowledge of the people even if suppressed. It is still more harmful and unjust to suppress or distort them to students who will be the leaders of the nation in a short time and who have easy access to and show a tendency to be influenced by Pakistani writing

<sup>52</sup> *Mediaeval Indian Culture*, pp. 107-08

<sup>53</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 99, fn

\* Dr Muhammad Sadiq, Principal of Dyal Singh College at Lahore, has this about him: "Their [of his poems] literary merit is not high, but here was a poet who tried to widen the sphere of poetry *by introducing themes represented in Persian poetry*": [<sup>1</sup> Italics mine], *History of Urdu Literature*, 1964, p. 49

on history and culture of India. The Muslim students of Aligarh who will certainly study Pakistani books on the subject will get off with the idea that their forbears in the Deccan, treating the Hindus very liberally, received nothing but opposition and ingratitude, that they helped forward the progress of local, regional and in essence Indian culture and were spurned by the Hindus!

The Hindus of the Deccan and middle South as a group, though there were many exceptions—and the common man was ready to do almost anything to keep himself alive especially as the region was struck by a very severe famine—were locked in mortal struggle with the Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan, which, to down their Hindu adversary had suppressed their internal quarrels. And the Hindu religious movements of the Deccan and the South during the period of the 14th to the 16th centuries were designed to meet the challenge of Islamization that was afoot either through Sufi propaganda or through political force, pressure or mere influence or all the three together.

The socio-cultural history of the North, properly viewed, raises the same presumption of the determined opposition of the two communities, living side by side and to all intents and purposes appearing to be resigned to the fact of having to carry on peaceful coexistence.

The house of Mewad, in its persistent, bold and even triumphant stand, typifies this situation on the political side. On the cultural side it is represented by the so-called "kirtistambha", the tower of fame, of Chitod raised by the famous Rana Kumbha and by the cold reception which the excellent teaching and sincere endeavour of Kabir (A.D. 1398-1492) received in the religious field.

About the "Tower of Fame" I shall have to make some comments in the architectural context. But about the good soul Kabir and his use made by Dr Tara Chand, Humayun Kabir and Professor Abid Husain, I must draw the readers' attention to the fact that, unlike Ramananda three generations before, and Tulasidasa a generation or two later, Kabir was not appreciated by the Hindus or even Muslims to any great extent. He remained an almost solitary figure whose lead only later proved a solace to and a prop of the self-respect of some downtrodden sections of Hindus.

This patent fact though passed over for convenience cannot be set aside. And Dr Tara Chand, who has properly appraised Akbar's attempt at the formulation of a new composite faith as another but royal and therefore power-backed endeavour in the chain being forged by Kabir, has to account for the failure of both. But having looked at both these attempts through coloured glasses he can offer only some *obiter dicta* and pious wishes as if they were historical facts. Instead of correcting his own view of these attempts and of considering them as aberrant endeavours of two great men, whose emotion—and in the case of Akbar, also the sense of power—ran the better of their reason, he looks upon them as "the forces

which were deeply surging in India's breast". If they were such forces, neither Dr Tara Chand nor anyone else would have had to remark rather fatalistically as he does (p. 165): "Circumstances thwarted that attempt, but destiny still points towards the same goal." An historian or a sociologist cannot arrogate to himself the role of the ordainer and speak of "destiny" in that strain. He can and should stick to the facts revealed in the complex of historical events; and if as in this case, the prophesied denouement has not come about in the four centuries that elapsed between Kabir and Akbar, on the one hand, and their appraiser Dr Tara Chand on the other, the latter should pronounce his opinion that their attempt was like crying for the moon.

I. Qureshi,<sup>54</sup> as a Pakistani national and Islamic advocate, naturally devotes many pages to Kabir, protesting *inter alia* that Kabir's debt to Ramananda was next to nothing. Paraphrasing Tara Chand in more florid language he observes about Kabir's influence: "The torch lit by Kabir ignited in course of time a wild fire which, carried upon the emotions of sincere seekers of spiritual ecstasy, spread to all corners of the subcontinent." And bringing in Dadu, A.D. 1544-1603, in the context, postulating deep influence of Sufi thought on him, and without mentioning any connection of Dadu with Ramananda or his school, he asserts that he went even further than Kabir "in the acceptance of Islamic doctrines and the Sufi methods of spiritual discipline." But he is frank enough to admit that the number of the followers of the school of Dadu is very small today. Qureshi has conveniently avoided describing the actual "conflagration" Kabir is supposed to have lighted excepting this reference to Dadu and a passing and briefer one to Kamal, Kabir's son. Merely mentioning that Kabir has a following even today both among Hindus and Muslims, each claiming Kabir as their co-religionist, he even affirms that there was among Kabir's contemporary Hindus and Muslims "popular resentment" against his teachings!

Qureshi has no problem to deal with regarding Kabir and Dadu as he has ignored their predecessors and successors and their doings, particularly the influence of Ramananda and Tulasidasa and the doings of Dadupanthis, who were in strong concentration in Rajasthan.<sup>55</sup> Aziz Ahmad<sup>56</sup> accepts more or less Tara Chand's and even Qureshi's estimate of Dadu's teaching and its source and does not ignore the historical fact that the Dadupanthis sect "transformed itself from an esoteric to a militant orientation", qualifying the transformation as gradual. He is intrigued by it and ascribes it, with very little justification, to the influence of "vairagis" (Bairagis) and the Sikhs. The truth is, as I pointed out some years

<sup>54</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 110-7. For Dadu see also Tara Chand, *op. cit.*, pp. 182-91.

<sup>55</sup> See my *Indian Sadhus*, 2nd ed., 1964.

<sup>56</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 148-9.

ago in the first edition of my book *Indian Sadhus*," Ramanandi ascetics established two ascetic centres, about 1500 A.D., one in the Punjab and the other at Galata near Jaipur in Rajasthan, and that about half a century earlier, ascetics had begun to have influence with the Rathod Rajputs. But the fighting section of these and other Vaishnava ascetic sects came to be organized only about 1650 A.D. i.e., more than two or three generations after similar sections of the Saiva ascetics known as Dasnami Nagas had come into existence.

The Dadupanthi ascetics came to be provided with the fighting Naga section by Sunderdasa, a direct disciple of Dadu, who lived in the period 1596-1680 A.D. Thus the transformation or rather differentiation—turning a section to being organized for fighting—was not slow or gradual but immediate.

This history of the most Islam-influenced (?) of the Vaishnava sects must convince any impartial student of history and culture that doctrines of purely religious character had nothing to do with the appraisal of the plight of Hindu culture and the specific remedy for its support and upkeep. As a matter of fact the ascetics coming to the rescue of the frightened and stupefied secular population supplied the necessary tonic to its waning spirit of firm and armed opposition to the then Muslim endeavour of submerging Hindu religion and culture.



## CHAPTER

### 7

## INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE: THREE VIEWS (III)

The attack on the conventional or accepted thought is dismissed as an inferior and, indeed, a wanton activity and, as such, not something that should be taken seriously.\*

J. K. GALBRAITH

THE APPEARANCE and success of Maulana Sheikh Ahmad of Sirhind as Professor Abid Husain has it (p. 168), or Mujaddid Alf-i-Sani Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi, or simply Mujaddid Alf-i-Sani as Dr Yasin has it (pp. 147-58), who was born in 1563 A.D., two years before the battle of Talikot and only a year before Akbar made an unprovoked war on and conquered the brave and self-respecting Hindu Rani Durgavati of Gondwana, is the Muslim counterpart of the Hindu reaction to such attempts as those of Kabir and Akbar. Sirhindi died, or "closed his eyes" as Dr Yasin puts it, in 1624 A.D., two years before Jahangir's death and the advent of a more rigidly Islamic monarch, Shahajahan. His role as a follower of Muslim religion in dealing with Hindus has already been noted. Here I must refresh my readers' memories about his views which speak of annihilation of Hindus.

In the words of Aziz Ahmad,<sup>1</sup> Sirhindi "regards Islam and *Kufr* (infidelity; in the context of India, Hinduism) as opposites, antithetical and therefore mutually exclusive. The two opposites *cannot integrate*; one can thrive only at the expense of the other. If the *unbelievers* find an opportunity they will reconvert Muslims to Hinduism or kill them off. It should therefore be realized that *the honour and security of Islam is dependent upon the humiliation of the unbelievers and their faith*".\*\* The fact that Sirhindi's "urs"<sup>2</sup> or anniversary celebration at Sirhind draws "thousands of

\* *The Affluent Society*, p. 281.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 185 Italics mine.

\*\* Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> Mohammad Yasin, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-8

"stream of ambassadors arriving from Turkey, Persia, and Central Asia... and scholars and soldiers of fortune who made their way to Delhi in search of a new career from all over the Muslim world".

Since the establishment of Muslim rule at Delhi by Qutbuddin Aibak, razing of Hindu temples as well as quarrying in them for convenient materials for raising mosques or even monumental buildings had become a constant feature of the activity of the Muslim monarchs in India. Aibak himself has recorded, on the wall of the Qutb mosque, which he built at Delhi and with which his more celebrated Qutb Minar is associated, the fact of having pulled down twenty-seven Hindu temples to provide materials for it.<sup>11</sup> The pillars in it are ascribed by Fergusson to the 11th or the 12th century, which means that Hindu temples were being built in Delhi and Ajmir region during the 11th and 12th centuries! The second mosque which Aibak built at Ajmir was similarly constructed out of materials procured by "dismantling a large number of the neighbouring temples".

Many other Muslim monarchs, for the purpose of providing for their mosques, must have done the same till their architects and artisans were fully prepared for independent constructions of their own choice and taste and in their own selected material. So widespread was this practice that a recent competent student of Indian architecture, and particularly of Muslim architecture in India, Percy Brown, was led to observe:

The historian quoted mentions that much of the demolition [of Hindu temples] was effected by elephant-power, these animals being employed to push the beams and pillars out of position, gather them up, and carry them to their new situation, much as they now stack timber, or haul teak wood logs for commercial purposes. It was during this phase that the temple buildings suffered most, as whenever any fresh territory was annexed, and the founding of city was contemplated, these structures became the quarries from which supplies of cut stone were extracted. *This accounts for considerable areas in Upper India being almost denuded of any records of Hindu architecture, notably around such early Islamic centres as Delhi and Ajmir.*<sup>12</sup>

Aziz Ahmad<sup>13</sup> frankly admits:

<sup>11</sup> Fergusson, *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, II, pp. 111, 152-3, 201 (1.11), 216; Percy Brown, *Indian Architecture*, I, pp. 133, 186, II, p. 39, pp. 4, 35, 37.

<sup>12</sup> Fergusson, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 321-2. Brown, II, pp. 4, 31, 37, 44. Ishwan Prasad, *A Short History of Muslim Rule in India*, pp. 84, 183, 186, 221, 469, 487, 492, 613; H. H. Dodwell, *The Cambridge Shorter History of India*, pp. 266-7, 307-8, 420-22, 428, 431-2, 590. Itahes mine Shri Ram Sharma, *The Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors* (2 ed., 1962), pp. 62, 86, 129-38.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 97-8 Italics mine.

*Iconoclasm as a pseudo-religious sport survived in Muslim India until the end of the seventeenth century.*

It appears, though it is not so clearly stated in any of the history books consulted by me, that there was either a law or a tacit convention established by Muslim monarchs in India that no new Hindu temple was to be built within their dominion without the previous permission of the monarch. Aziz Ahmad<sup>14</sup> affirms that "The theoretical policy of the Muslim state in India was to withhold permission for building new Hindu temples and to discourage the repair of old ones", and states that Sultan Zayn al-Abidin of Kashmir (d. 1472) and Akbar were the "outstanding exceptions to this theoretical policy".

Shahjahan reverted to the old policy and issued orders forbidding the completion of temples, whose construction was started during Jahangir's reign. He also prohibited the building of new temples or repairs to old temples. And it is an historical fact that about 80 Hindu temples were actually destroyed in Northern India in pursuance or in execution of his orders. Aurangzeb's activity in this line was so great and varied that Professor S. R. Sharma has devoted about ten pages to describe it!<sup>15</sup>

I. Qureshi<sup>16</sup> has to take great deal of pains to dress this matter up to make it appear not utterly unrepresentable and revulsionary. He does it first by representing, as if it was only Shahjahan—note that like his father Jahangir he too was a Hindu mother's son—who imposed "*the Islamic law that no idol temple could be built without the permission of the state*". He then sweetly expects his readers to be satisfied that such a restriction "could not be imposed with any thoroughness in an overwhelmingly Hindu region". His third line of making this kind of activity of the Islamic rulers of India look less tyrannical is much more ridiculous, and to my mind makes the activity more tyrannical, odious, and reprehensible. He asserts that only "a few unauthorized temples" were destroyed and vouchsafes the intention of the measure to have been "more a declaration that Islam would *again* be treated as the dominant religion rather than an attempt at the suppression of Hinduism". There was not the least need for any declaration of the "dominant" nature of Islam in North India for Shahjahan by then, and the least so after Jahangir. Jahangir's public celebration of this fact is quoted above from his own autobiography!

Shahjahan—who made much more effective, impressive, and purposeful use of the marble of Rajasthan, which, as Percy Brown<sup>17</sup> informs us, was first brought into use by his father Jahangir, and whose Moti mosque at

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.

<sup>15</sup> Sri Ram Sharma, *The Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors* (2nd ed., 1962), pp. 62, 86, 129-38; Aziz Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 159. Italics mine.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*, p. 110.

Agra begun in 1654 happens to be the first one in pure marble and remains the most elegant of marble creations—began his mosque-building activity at least in 1634, i.e., only 7 years after his accession to the throne, in which year he built Wazir Khan's mosque in Lahore. The building stands unique for having the most variegated ornamentation in colours and lustrous glaze. Announcing his Islam to be Persia-oriented, Shahjahan had thus proclaimed early the dominant position of Islam in India, so supreme that—though in the absence of complete lists of mosques built by all the Islamic monarchs that ruled over North India from the 13th century, and the Muslim monarchs that dominated the South from the 14th to the 18th century, it is not sound to make a numerically comparative statement, I cannot help mentioning my impression that of them all Shahjahan perhaps built the largest number. Of the 13 mosques referred to by Percy Brown in his account of the architectural activity of the Moghul monarchs from Babur to Aurangzeb, Shahjahan claims five while Aurangzeb is credited with four. Three of Shahjahan's five mosques, whose dimensions alone are available, covered more than 160,000 square feet of area. So big were they besides being uniquely distinctive in material and ornamentation!

Apropos of the assertion of I. Qureshi putting forward the need of proclaiming the ascendancy of Islam, it is necessary to note the extent of purely Islamic—fully religious as in the case of mosques, or pseudo-religious as in the case of mausolea for the remains of the dead—building that was done at the cost of the state. Nobody knows the total number of mosques built by noblemen and officials of the Muslim monarchs which probably were all or most of them financed out of the public exchequer; and we have naturally to leave them out. The total number of mosques built by the Muslim rulers, Imperial, Regional or Local, too, is not available. I have made a rough count of the mosques referred to by Percy Brown in his book *Indian Architecture (The Islamic Period)* as regal buildings. They number not less than 135. The measurements of only 25 out of them are available from two sources, Fergusson's book and Brown's book. The total area occupied by these 25 mosques measures 1.14 million square feet! Surely such dimensional extent, added to the numerical abundance, spatial distribution, and architectural distinctness, combined with material and/or colour differentiation, was more than sufficient to stamp the faith typified by the mosque as the overweeningly dominant religion of the land, except in the few places where the great Hindu temples were able to rear up their heads! In so far as this building activity, whether on regal or on private account, was certainly far in excess of the religious needs<sup>18</sup> of the

<sup>18</sup> According to Bernier there were "hundred of Gentiles (i.e., Hindus) to one Mogol, or even to one Mahometan." Dr Yasin (*op. cit.*, p. 44), who quotes the above statement, thinks that it was an exaggeration and quotes Gemeli Careri's opinion ". . . for in India there is scarce a Mahometan among fifty men".

small Muslim population of those times, it cannot but be concluded that a large amount of the public money and an equally large amount of human material were diverted by the Muslim monarchs in the channel of silent propaganda for their own religion.

The above account can be seen to be a brief narration of historical facts vouchsafed for by meticulous non-Hindu writers in the main and their veracity is inferentially attested to by the subterfuges which two Pakistani writers have adopted to circumvent the adverse verdict of history on Muslim monarchs of India. The third Pakistani writer, Hafecz Malik,<sup>19</sup> as usual, is more frank, and states matter-of-factly the truth of the prohibitory law in the particular cases of Firuz Shah Tughlak, Shahjahan and Aurangzeb.

In view of all this Professor Humayun Kabir's lame and specious excuse, doing great violence to the history of temple-architecture, bespeaks his intense bias. He<sup>20</sup> says about temples and their destruction by Muslim monarchs: "They were also at times strong forts and occupied positions of strategic importance. Their subjugation was often necessary for military purposes." Walled temples in fact came in only after the 12th century and the walls were mostly plain and, in the case of South Indian temples, high. It was not the temple of Kangra, which Jahangir desecrated, that offered resistance to his forces but the fort of Kangra! Hardly any temple can be said to have occupied a strategic point!

General Cunningham,<sup>21</sup> a profound student of Indian antiquities, made almost a century ago, an observation which, most emphatically, states the truth about destruction of Hindu temples by Muslim rulers. It reads: "But as the erection of a mosque by Muhammadan conqueror always implies the previous destruction of a Hindu temple, I infer that the neighbouring temple of the sun must have been pulled down by Altamsh."

Professor Abid Husain's statements about Muslim monarchs and Hindu temples in the brochure *Indian Culture*, meant for the general education of Aligarh University students, are not only distortion of historical facts but also such as must, in the long run, prove harmful. About the great tower of Delhi's Qutub Minar raised by the first Muslim monarch of Delhi he makes an assertion which is a specimen of *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*. When Professor Husain assures his readers further that under Jahangir, Shahjahan, and even Aurangzeb "Hindu temples were given land grants as liberally as Muslim mosques" he not only overstates the actuality but also makes a statement for which historical evidence is lacking. If there was any undoubted evidence surely the Pakistani writers, Aziz Ahmad and Hafecz Malik would have trotted it forth in all exuberance. I. Qureshi<sup>22</sup> can point to only a Pakistani Hindu's paper published in the *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society* (1957) for some support of Hindu

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 22, 24, 57, 66-7, 76.

<sup>20</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 15

<sup>21</sup> *Archaeological Survey Report*, Vol. II, p. 354

<sup>22</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 161.

temples by Aurangzeb. Professor Husain in his rather surprising eagerness to whitewash the demolitional activity of Muslim generals and monarchs in India—though his intention, viz., of helping the integrational process is good—does violence to history.

In the same brochure Professor Husain assures his Muslim readers (p. 18):

About the painting, the sculpture and the architecture of the Puranic Hindu period, we know very little because fewer works of art of this age are now in existence than those of the earlier Buddhist age. As far as buildings are concerned the reason . . . seems to be two-fold. First, most of the structures were built of lacquered wood . . . and secondly the valleys of the Ganges and the Yamuna which formed the hub or centre of the Puranic Hindu culture had been overrun for centuries by wild Central Asian tribes, Huns, Gurjars, etc. and most of the buildings had been destroyed during their invasions. Also one or two fanatical rulers of the Delhi Sultanate pulled down temples.

It would be more correct to say that only two or three rulers did not pull down temples purposely. Hiuen Tsang's testimony for the existence of a number of temples right upto the North-West belies Husain's maligning of the Huns and the Gurjars!

The reaction against infiltration of Hindu ideas into religio-philosophical matters, the campaign of hate against them and the call to treat them as downtrodden, to push forward the cause of Islam proclaimed by Muqaddid Sirhindi thus bore fruit in the royal wills of Jahangir and Shahjahan progressively adopting items of his programme and implementing them. They reached the climax during the reign of the last of the great Moghul monarchs, Aurangzeb, about whose historic role, as Aziz Ahmad<sup>23</sup> has rightly observed, there are two most distinct views among Muslims "from apologetics to adulation", Ahmad himself reflecting the former and S. M. Jaffar<sup>24</sup> the latter. Ahmad justifies Aurangzeb on the ground of "the danger of spiritual submergence of Indian Islam in Hinduism" in the event of an Akbar-like or non-Aurangzeb-like Muslim monarch coming to the Delhi throne at that time.

There is a third view of Aurangzeb even among Muslims, which from slightly different viewpoints, is represented in two varieties by I. Qureshi and Hafeez Malik. The latter prefers to withhold the blame, which is implied in his judgment as a historian evaluating Aurangzeb's career, and observes:

He left behind the Indian sub-continent not only *his nation of Moslems*,

<sup>23</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 200

<sup>24</sup> *Some Cultural Aspects of Muslim Rule in India*, 2nd ed., 1950, pp. 70-8.

*who had from the beginning been a separate cultural and political entity, but two other potential nations, the Hindus and the Sikhs. All of them struggled for hegemony in the eighteenth century.*"<sup>25</sup>

I. Qureshi,<sup>26</sup> though he shows his great admiration, implying adulation, of Aurangzeb by referring to him throughout as Alamgir I, is more openly critical of his role in the debacle of Islamic rule in India that came on about fifty years after Aurangzeb's death. He says:

The reasons for the decline and fall of the Muslim Empire were complex and multifarious; orthodoxy, however, shares the blame with other sections of Indian Islam for its failure to identify itself with the other sects in an effort to save the heritage of the Muslims from collapse.

The correct historical view of Aurangzeb would emphasize his failure to understand the soul of India, the spirit and temper of the mild, nay almost cowardlooking, Hindus, and particularly the signs of the time and the inherent injustice of persecution of a subject people. As for his share in the debacle of the Muslim rule, history would ask his valuers to bear in mind the fact—or shall we say the accident—that his successor did not prove to be another Aurangzeb, Shahjahan, Akbar or Babur, a man of towering ability, drive and martial capacity.

At the end of Aurangzeb's career the inherent opposition of the Hindus and Muslims, the endeavour of the former to survive and regain their patrimony and the determination of the latter to conquer, subdue, and if possible to destroy them, became quite clearly set and hardened.

Dr Yasin has kindly provided data which support this contention and prepare a student of history for the developments that finally culminated in the defeat of the Maratha army on the battle field of Panipat in 1761. Commenting on his own statement that "the growing orthodox reaction during this period [1605-1758 A.D.] gave a further impetus to racial discrimination" in a footnote (p. 49) he asserts that "it had been found next to impossible to brigade these two creeds [Hindu and Muslim] together for a campaign under one general" and adduces two illustrations, one from the North and the other from Bijapur.

And there was physical register of this fact of separation in the spatial segregation of the two communities, which has continued to this day more or less unabated not only in large villages and taluka-towns but in also great and cosmopolitan cities like Bombay. For the pre-Akbar period of Muslim rule in North India, i.e., for the period 1200 to 1550 A.D., Ashraf's<sup>27</sup> careful summary from Urdu and Persian source material regarding

<sup>25</sup> Hafeez Malik, *op. cit.*, p. 86 Italics mine.

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 162.

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 267-8.

the city plans reads: "The city was divided into separate quarters for various social groups. . . The rest of the population divided itself into religious, racial and even occupational groups. For instance, Muslims and Hindus had separate quarters." Dr Yasin<sup>28</sup> does not enlighten us on the population distribution in cities of his period of Muslim India but informs us of the "strong aversion" of Muslims for country life thus: "Even the poorer classes of the Muslims shivered at the idea of going to villages as if they were exiled for some misdoing."

Aziz Ahmad's<sup>29</sup> statement which explains the oft-repeated assertion of Dr Tara Chand, Professor Humayun Kabir and Professor Abid Husain about the synthesis of Hindu-Muslim cultures into the complex called Hindustani culture and upholds my thesis adumbrated here, as correct, furnishes a balanced appraisal of the situation. He says:

Some Hindu communities like the Kayasthas, the Khattris, the Pandits of Kashmir and the Amils of Sind *adopted Muslim Culture, cultivated Muslim language and literature, and even moulded their domestic life to the Muslims way of living* . . .

The most "glowing" illustration of this synthetic achievement is afforded by the Persian writing of Ramlal (date not given, but appears to be early 18th century). Aziz Ahmad has highly obliged his readers and students of Indian history and sociology by a statement from Ramlal's valuable outpouring. Says Ahmad: <sup>30</sup> "He shows no Hindu bias in his description of the Marathas, *regards Shivaji as a traitor in accordance with the Muslim historical tradition which he follows even in repeating verbatim the formula describing the Maratha leader's death: 'And Shiva departed to hell.'*"

The intensity of the Hindu opposition to the Muslim rule and the sternness of the Muslim reprisal are best judged from the enormity of the loss of Hindu lives during Muslim rule in India. Jatindra Mohan Dutta has taken the trouble to make a calculation of the loss of Hindu lives in three of the most notorious massacres of Hindus recorded in the pre-Mughal history of Islamic rule in India, about the middle of the 14th century. Two of these massacres were made by Tughlak kings in the North and one by a Bahamani king in the South to which reference is made above. Dutta, putting the population of India then at 88.5 millions computes the percentage of the population massacred as 1.22 and remarks: "These three slaughters alone wiped out the national growth for more than 25 years or nearly a generation."<sup>31</sup> Adding to this number, the number of those killed on the battlefield, particularly of the gallant and chivalrous Rajput flowers

<sup>28</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 25-6.

<sup>29</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 105, *Italics mine*.

<sup>30</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 238, *Italics mine*.

<sup>31</sup> *Modern Review*, 1961, pp. 46-49.



of men, and of the women who performed "jauhar", i.e., killed themselves in self-respect and honour, one would get a staggering percentage of Hindu lives in the prime of youth sacrificed in the cause of opposition to Muslim rule!

The stubborn opposition of the Hindus, after the gallant and chivalrous Rajputs were liquidated through conciliation, endearment and conquest, was first carried on by the Jats of the adjacent region, and, then by the Marathas of the Deccan, who dared to sally out from their mountain lairs into the open fields of North India on their punny ponies defying the devil himself, and later by the Sikhs who by then had been so enraged by the actions of the Muslim monarchs that they had turned themselves into a military organization ready to meet the challenge. This phenomenon of a religious sect, formulated as a kind of synthesis between the old Hindu faith and the new Muslim creed, turning with a drawn sword in hand against the followers of the new creed, Islam in India, which had proved itself to be the proximate cause of its rise and its *raison d'être*, should convince any student of history and culture that the opposition between the Hindu and the Muslim was an inherent one and not an adventitious phenomenon capable of being resolved through talk of sweet reasonableness or some emotionally appealing words.

The rise of Shah Waliullah Dehlawi (1703-1763 A.D.) testifies to the correctness of this view. I have mentioned in brief his position in the world of Islamic thought as evaluated in the Indian-Government book *History of Eastern and Western Philosophy* in an earlier chapter. I have also mentioned along with him Shahid Sayyid Ahmad Bareilvi (1786-1831 A.D.) who came in the second generation after Waliullah and was the first on the Indian soil to proclaim "jihad", a religious war, or the sacred duty of war, against infidels, the non-Muslim inhabitants of India, declaring India to be Dar-al-Harb,<sup>32</sup> i.e., an area where Islam had been deprived of its authority.

Both of them played an important role in the political history of India. And both are looked upon as Islamic heroes who spent their lives in bringing back Indian Islam to its Islamic purity, the former particularly in the realm of Islamic thought.

Hafeez Malik's chapter entitled "Religious Nationalism" opens with his tribute to Shah Waliullah thus: "The political chaos that resulted from the disintegration of the Moslem political power was bound to affect all phases of national life—social, ethical and religious. It inspired thinkers like Shah Waliullah to attempt a revitalization of Islamic and the Moslem nation in India."<sup>33</sup> I. Qureshi states the position much more emotionally and in lurid colours. He says, almost at the beginning of his chapter "A diagnosis of the Disease".

<sup>32</sup> Qureshi, pp. 196-207; Malik, *Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan*, pp. 156-84; Ahmad, pp. 210-7; Yasin, pp. 176-7.

<sup>33</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 123.

The safety of the community [Muslims in India] had formerly been secured through a sturdy defence, which could be sustained only by drawing continuously upon a reservoir of moral stamina; it collapsed when the inner strength had been frittered away. . . . However, such occasions do sometimes produce analytical thinkers who try to diagnose the disease which overtakes a people. The plight of this community [Muslims in India] produced Shah Waliullah.<sup>31</sup>

Aziz Ahmad, whose primary concern is with Islamic culture in India and neither with Indian history nor even with Islamic history in India and much less with Indian culture, heads a whole chapter as "The Wali-Ullahi Movement". He speaks of Shah Waliullah linking him with his contemporary but more famous Arab divine Abd-al-Wahhab, whose name is commemorated in the important pan-Islamic movement known as Wahhabism, and describes his main work as meant "to rehabilitate the theory and practice of orthodox Sunni belief" and approvingly points out that it was written in Arabic and not in Persian.<sup>32</sup>

The Indian Muslim scholar, whose writing otherwise is marked by balanced nationalist spirit, Dr Yasin, not only sees in Shah Waliullah the continuator of the mission of purifying Indian Islam but also speaks of him as "another Mujaddid of Islam in India". And he has obliged us by informing us that Waliullah was a sort of a descriptive title, affixed by the common consent of the Muslims, meaning "a deputy of God". Because he was a native of Delhi his full designation is Shah Waliullah Mujaddid Dehlawi.

Shah Waliullah stayed in Mecca for more than a year when he was about 29 years old and performed the *Hajj* twice before returning to Delhi in 1731 A.D. Dr Yasin thus appraises his work.

Shah Waliullah tried to mould the life of the Musalmans according to the Islamic conception of a perfect man. But his efforts were no more successful than those of his predecessors. Though Shah Waliullah failed to remodel the Muslim society of his day, *with them his writings are still an asset to be read with delight and benefit.*<sup>33</sup>

It appears to me that this valuation is not quite correct. It is evident from the facts, separate from opinions and views, which the three Pakistani authors, Qureshi, Ahmad and Malik have revealed that though Shah Waliullah's following was restricted and only select in the beginning, the work of teaching, which his one nobleman-admirer and follower, Najib-ud-Daulah the Rohilla chief of Saharanpur, spread through his *madressa*

<sup>31</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 177.

<sup>32</sup> Aziz Ahmad, *op. cit.*, pp. 201, 202, 203, 205, 206, 207, 208.

<sup>33</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 172-3. Italic mine

at Najibabad, had carried his message of purity, rigidity, and also *jihād* to "hundreds of thousands of uneducated Moslems".<sup>47</sup> And Sayyid Ahmad Bareilvi, the first *Shahid*, martyr, of Indian Muslims, and the third member of the revitalizing and militant trio of Indian Islam of the post-Akbar age, was a disciple of Waliullah's son and religious successor.<sup>48</sup> Further the so-called Muslim theological academy of Deoband in U.P. was more or less directly the inspiration of Waliullah's immediate followers who worked in Delhi till 1857. Deobands "Dar-ul-ulum", starting its new work in 1867, had Shah Waliullah for its "religious mentor" and "his works" as "its text books". Malik informs us that the organizers and conductors of the academy, or seminary, planned "to train enough *ulama* to be able to send them out into the country where *they would teach Shah Waliullah's philosophy in the mosques*", and also that they "aimed at closer relations with Ottoman Turkey."<sup>49</sup>

Professor Abid Husain's appraisal of Shah Waliullah and Sayyid Ahmad Shahid in his *National Culture of India* (p. 168) concludes on a note which is correct as far as it goes, though, in excluding the chief impact of Waliullah on separatism and on the duty of *jihād* by Muslims in India, it conceals or ignores a significant aspect of the whole. He says:

But the purely social and religious reform movement started by Shah Waliullah and his sons had more success among a section of Muslims who gave up superstitious beliefs and luxurious habits and began to live a pure and austere life like Muslims in the early days of Islam.

Waliullah's objective was not merely to lead Muslims in India back to the purity of Muhammad's Islam but to achieve through this process the shedding of whatever beliefs and practices current among the Muslims that savoured of Hindu likeness, flavour or colour.<sup>50</sup> He had further the purpose of rallying back the Muslim political power more or less on the Moghul pattern.<sup>51</sup> And to this end he first directed his energies towards accomplishing a working compromise between the Sunnis and Shias, and thus to prevent grave internal split. He took up the difficult task of attempting harmonization and unification of the different schools of Sufism which enabled him to achieve a double triumph and to enlist sovereign aid. The triumph was ideological and anti-Hinduizational in so far as the schools would drop their tenets and practices homologous to some of the Hindu Vedantic or other beliefs and practices. It served a double purpose as it

<sup>47</sup> Malik, p. 138. Qureshi pp. 197, 205.

<sup>48</sup> Ahmad, p. 210. Qureshi, pp. 194-7.

<sup>49</sup> Malik, pp. 191-2. Italics mine. Professor Abid Husain, *National Culture of India* p. 169, gives 1868 as the year of the founding of the Deoband seminary.

<sup>50</sup> Malik, p. 137. Ahmad, p. 209. Qureshi, p. 191.

<sup>51</sup> W. C. Smith, *Islam in Modern History*, p. 45.

divested the Muslims of Hindu similarities and at the same time assimilated them in the larger community of Islam, thus separating them from Hindu and Indian citizens. The resulting solidarity of the Muslims served Waliullah's political aim which he pushed forward in a systematic and vigorous manner.

The motive of effecting the solidarity of the Muslims in India can explain Waliullah's rather curious declaration that "anyone who had once professed himself to be a Muslim, remained so, whatever his sins or failings".<sup>42</sup>

All the three Pakistani authors<sup>43</sup> mentioned and drawn upon in this study have mentioned Waliullah's role in the signal defeat of the Marathas on the battlefield of Panipat near Delhi in 1761, only four years short of the bicentenary of the Hindu rout at Talikot in the South more than a thousand miles away.

Aziz Ahmad who is the least enthusiastic about it says:

It can be inferred that in shaping the alliance between Abdali and Najib al-Dawlah /Najib-ud-Daulah/ and especially in the former's organization of the campaign, which resulted in the crushing defeat of the Maratha confederacy at Panipat in 1761, these letters of Shah Waliullah may have played some part.

Qureshi is very much more certain and nostalgically appreciative and says:

The Rohillah chief through whom Shah Waliullah sought to implement his short-term mission of curbing the forces of anarchy was Najib-ud-dawlah. . . . Shah Waliullah also corresponded with Ahmad Shah Abdali, to whom he related the sufferings of the Muslims and pointed out *his duties as a Muslim monarch to strive to save them from the clutches of their tormentors.*

Of the great victory of the Muslims at Panipat in 1761 he says:

If the Muslims had shown any vigour and foresight, they might have solved the Maratha problem forever. The triumph of Muslim arms at Pampat was the culmination of Shah Waliullah's political efforts so far as his short term programme was concerned, because he died in the following year.

Malik observes:<sup>44</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 203

<sup>43</sup> Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 203

<sup>44</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 118. Italics mine

Najib-ud-Daulah's policy of collaboration with Abdali had the support of the Moslem population of India. In fact his invitation to Abdali was inspired by the advice of Shah Waliullah, *one of the greatest thinkers ever produced by the Moslems of the sub-continent.*

The importance that Muslim Indians attach to Waliullah and the pride with which their elite look upon him for his part in the battle of Panipat, which they considered to be decisive, are demonstrated by the fact that so recently as in 1951 Khaliq Ahmad Nizami published a longish paper in the Journal *Islamic Culture* (pp. 133-45), which began its publication in Hyderabad in 1927 and continues today in a more sumptuous and enlarged form, entitled "Shah Wali-Ullah Dehlavi (1702-1762) and Indian Politics in the 18th Century". Nizami's views are not very different from those of Qureshi and Malik. But the great importance of his paper for us lies in the more or less complete text in excerpts, with their English translation, from the letters written by Shah Waliullah to Najib-ud-Daulah and Ahmad Shah Abdali which it embodies. My only surprise and regret are that Nizami unkindly has not given us the translation of one small excerpt which embodies Waliullah's estimate of the Marathas.

Hafeez Malik's final estimate<sup>45</sup> of Shah Waliullah that "He laid the foundation of a religio-political philosophy that is still alive in Pakistan" and that "*in fact he is to Pakistan what Martin Luther is to Germany*" as well as his own view that an appraisal of the "*religio-social beliefs of the Moslems in Pakistan today*" makes Shah Waliullah "*their national Imam*", may be noted. It cannot be said to be confined to Pakistani Muslims.

This hero of Muslims whether in Pakistan or in India as an ideal type is a portent which non-Muslim Indians ought to note with due concern. The hero-types of a people or a community are a guide to their minds and an index of their attitudes in certain matters which are of the deepest concern to a multi-grouped, multi-community nation.

The Muslim jubilation over the defeat inflicted on the Maratha army by Muslim armies, represented in Shah Waliullah's terminology as the soldiers of Islam, after all proved to be short-lived. The national spirit of the Hindus was up. And that is why we have Pakistani Qureshi's nostalgic regret that the Muslims did not attempt to drive home the advantage gained at Panipat. Qureshi's pre-occupation with Islamic greatness prevented him from realizing the fact of the upsurge of the Hindu national spirit, which was so wisely, assiduously and fervently created, fostered and spread by Shivaji, Ramadas and the Marathi-speaking leaders of the then Maharashtra, and of the waning of the Muslim capacity to conquer and to absorb the ever resilient, though pacific and placid-looking Hindus.

Hafeez Malik, more concerned with history, and to judge from his book very much better informed about non-Muslim aspects of Indian history

<sup>45</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 139, Italics mine.

during the Muslim period, is a surprisingly pleasant contrast not only to I. Qureshi but also to the contributors to the Union-Government-sponsored *History of Philosophy*,—the Hindu gentleman Dr Tara Chand, and the two Muslim gentlemen, one being a legal practitioner and the other a professional philosopher—in as much as he devotes some space not only to the great statesman soldier Shivaji but also to his Maharashtra, and what is even more striking to the ascetic-philosopher and political invigorator, Ramadas, to understand the Hindu upsurge. He says of "the revolution of Shivaji", of the pious saints of his Maharashtra and of Ramadas in particular:

A study of the preachings and writings of *the Hindu holy men in the Deccan who spoke politics in terms of religion helps to understand the resurgence of national feelings among the Hindu masses and the political aims of Shivaji*. The holy men believed that northern India was impotent under the Moslem rule. . . . Among the Deccani saints who stand out prominently is Ramdas, a contemporary of Shivaji . . . *Ramdas' own writings deal with religion and politics. They are acute, penetrating and breathe an intense national spirit. Styling himself "SAMARTH" (powerful), Ramdas stood for an all-round national regeneration. The Hindus who lived in the "maths" were profoundly impressed by the teachings of Ramdas as expounded in his great work the Dasa-bodha.*<sup>46</sup>

It is not only an irony but also a painful indication that the so-called Indian-Government-sponsored intellectuals are still beset with the old sin of the lack of historical perspective, that they should have failed to note the thought-currents of Ramdas and to have turned blind even to the spiritualizing role of Tulasidas, when they could dwell on the "glories" of the thoughts (?) of Sirhindi, Waliullah and even Bareilly!

Another batch of Government-sponsored intellectuals, the Emotional Integration Committee, digging for the history of the absence of integration in India, and darkening still the already sufficiently blackened villain of "caste", indulged in presenting a hearsay as a historical truth maligning *inter alia* the Brahmin caste. It told the public that "one reason why the historic Third Battle of Panipat [1761] was lost was that a contemptuous remark from the Brahman commander of the Peshwa's force" had "turned the Jat chieftan of Bharatpur from a powerful ally into a disinterested on-looker".<sup>47</sup>

This is evidently a reference to the behaviour of Surajmal the Jat Chief of Bharatpur. Jadunath Sarkar,<sup>48</sup> India's leading historian of the second quarter of the 20th century, writing in 1934, did not consider the reported

<sup>46</sup> Hafeez Malik, pp. 78-9.

<sup>47</sup> *Report of the Committee on Emotional Integration*, 1962, p. 19.

<sup>48</sup> *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, Vol. II (1934), pp. 255, 257-8.

assertion of Sadashivrao Bhau's having insulted Surajmal as true. He held that Surajmal's estrangement was immediately due to his shrewdness, to his advice being not valued and to his appreciation that he was not to get in Delhi the position he desired from Bhau. Sarkar, in the footnote where he has stated his conviction, has quoted the reported statement, from which it is clear that even the supposed insult did not bear necessarily on caste. It was rather based on the nature of military status. The diarist says that Bhau "insulted Surajmal by calling him a landholder". The Maratha historian G. S. Sardesai<sup>49</sup> has flatly contradicted the suggestion that Surajmal's non-cooperation was the result of differences or that it was wrathful. He attributes it to his shrewdness to keep himself free to profit by the conflict. He has adduced contemporary evidence showing that Surajmal was very helpful in the aftermath of the Maratha rout at Panipat.

Contrast this specimen of historical truth-seeking of "patriotic" Indian intellectuals in deliberation with a single Pakistani intellectual's performance. Hafeez Malik, of whose painstaking historical knowledge I have given an illustration in regard to Panipat campaign and battle, went much deeper into its antecedents and accompaniments. He mentions the fact that Surajmal Jat, who had accompanied the Marathas to Delhi as an ally had "retired to the fortress of Belan Gur." He, however, attributes Surajmal's behaviour to his having been "shocked by this spectacle" of the Maratha soldiers plundering the imperial palace. He further informs us that Sadashivrao Bhau's plan—this was "the Brahman commander of the Peshwa's force" no ordinary man but Peshwa's own brother, and a young and valiant general who had his nephew, Peshwa's young son, with him in the army—was to capture Sirhindi and join Ala Singh, another Jat chief and other Hindu zamindars of the cis-Satlaj region. Bhau, who had formed an alliance and depended on its operative effectiveness—with another Jat, can hardly be so caste-conscious as the Emotional Integration Committee in its cavalier fashion, casting about for some scapegoat, would have the readers of its Report believe.

Hafeez Malik<sup>50</sup> as a true Pakistani attempts to defend Najib-ud-Daulah's conduct by rating Jadunath Sarkar for "his utter lack of understanding of the Moslem mind in the middle of the 18th century".

Professor Gupta<sup>51</sup> thus comments on the defection of Surajmal:

The charge levelled against Bhau by Grant Duff is wholly unjustified. He writes that "all the Maratha accounts impute Sóoraj Mull's defection wholly to Bhau's misconduct". Similarly Sir Jadunath's allegation seems

<sup>49</sup> *History of Modern India, Part II, Maratha Period, Vol. IV* (1922), pp. 150, 155, 175, 183, 191, 193, 195, 204-5, 228-9; *New History of the Marathas, Vol. II*, 1417-9; 419, 443.

<sup>50</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 118-20.

<sup>51</sup> Hari Ram Gupta, *Marathas and Panipat*, 1961, pp. 139, 156.

to be unfounded. He says that the Bhau "insulted and alarmed the Jat king beyond hope of appeasement".

The third member of the trio, whom the Pakistani writers hold up as the generators of Muslim nationalism, religious, cultural, and political, is Shahid Sayyid Ahmad Bareilvi (1776-1831 A.D.) of Rae Bareilly. With him "ends the series of the Mujaddids of Islam in India", as Dr Yasin<sup>52</sup> says, and, as I shall add, begins one of "Shahids", martyrs. For Hafeez Malik<sup>53</sup> speaks of a grandson of Shah Waliullah who was three years younger than Bareilvi as Shahid. About the same time a Bengali Muslim, Haji Shariat Ullah is known to have preached the doctrine that Bengal too, was no longer Dar-ul-Islam, the logical and emotional upshot of such a declaration being the starting of a religious war.

Aziz Ahmad speaking of "the militant movement of the rehabilitation of Islam in India [politically of course as the ruler], categorized as 'Wahhabî' by the British in the nineteenth century... and as that of the 'mujahidin' (holy warriors) in modern Muslim Indo-Pakistan", and tracing it down to "the Tribal War of 1897-8", deals with the career of Sayyid Ahmad Bareilvi under the caption "The movement of the Mujahidin".<sup>54</sup>

Sayyid Ahmad made Patna his centre of activity and had also a great following in Calcutta. The Nawab of Tonk was a great admirer of his; so too was the ruler of Rampur state.<sup>55</sup>

Qureshi<sup>56</sup> is at pains to make out that Waliullah and even Sayyid Ahmad, Haji Shariatullah and Dada Miyan of Bengal were reformers, though he could not avoid the temptation of proclaiming the latter three to have been also the warriors of Islam. He heads the chapter dealing with their doings as "Reformers and Warriors". Hafeez Malik, evidently taking his clue from the Pakistani *History of Freedom Movement*, heads the chapter of his book which treats of the life and doings of Shahid Sayyid Ahmad as "Struggle for National Liberation". He thus informs his readers quite frankly that Pakistan of today is one, but partial, resultant fruit of the liberation struggle of Muslims in the then India which was begun by Shahid Sayyid Ahmad.

Shahid Sayyid Ahmad propounded and preached the exclusion of three kinds of excesses from among the Muslims in India:

1. The Sufi indifference towards the "external tenets of religious law, poetic licence in one's attitude to God or His Prophet, idolization of one's spiritual preceptor, and homage to saints' tombs";

<sup>52</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 176.

<sup>53</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 158, 191.

<sup>54</sup> Qureshi, pp. 209-10. Ahmad, pp. 209-17.

<sup>55</sup> Malik, pp. 159, 161, 162-4, 165, 171, 183-4. Qureshi, p. 210.

<sup>56</sup> *Op.*, 192-211.



2. the Shia celebration of Muharram as a public festival; and
3. practices "borrowed from the Hindus" such as pilgrimages to Hindu holy places, shouting Hindu religious slogans, "borrowings from Hindu animism, consulting Brahmins for good or bad omens, and celebration of Hindu festivals".<sup>57</sup>

He wrote letters to the rulers of Bukhara and Afghanistan inviting them to "re-establish Islamic rule in India".<sup>58</sup>

Aziz Ahmad's appraisal of the movement of *Mujahidin* as "in many ways a unique one in the history of Indian Islam" and his translation of it in the terminology of Arnold Toynbee as "archaic effort to recover India from the British and their Hindu and Sikh allies" is a frank and correct evaluation which only highlights Indian history from the purely Muslim viewpoint. For this gentleman, the so-called "Shahid", does not figure either in the *Cambridge Shorter History of India* or even in the longer one but is given importance to by Muslims. The high-sounding and pre-deterministic reference not only to the movement by Ahmad as "forecasting the ideology of Pakistan but also to its result" as "a curiosity of history that over a century before the creation of Pakistan, two miniature Muslim states struggled vaguely on the horizon of realization . . . situated in the same Muslim majority areas which to-day constitute Pakistan" demonstrates the fervent sentiment which exists in the minds of Muslims of Pakistan even today.

Professor Abid Husain's careful and purposeful paragraph devoted to the three militant workers or "reformers", who are better described as isolationists or separatists from the viewpoint of not only the majority community of the Hindus but also from the strictly historical and nationalist point of view of India, emphasizes the strength of this sentiment among Muslims in India. He has brought in the trio of Sirhindi (1564-1624 A.D.), Waliullah (1703-1763 A.D.) and Bareilly (1786-1831 A.D.) with the addition of Shah Abdul Haq Dehlavi (1551-1642 A.D.) and two co-workers of Bareilly in his chapter "Reaction against English Culture" which is an indication that his sympathies, his better though not overt judgment on them and their work, run in the same channel as those of Aziz Ahmad, looking upon them as the pioneers among the liberators of Indian Muslims! The precise wording of his appraisal of the work of Bareilly and his two co-workers strengthens this view: He says:<sup>59</sup>

These three militant reformers with the help of an armed force of volunteers *wrested the Western Punjab and the North-West Frontier region from the Sikh Government with the intention of turning it into a model Islamic state* (1815). But the differences with the Pathans weakened the

<sup>57</sup> Ahmad, *op. cit.*, pp. 211-2. Italics mine.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 213.

<sup>59</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 168 Italics mine.

hold of the reformers on the conquered territory and after a few years they were defeated by the Sikhs at Balakot. Maulana Syed Ahmad [Shahid Sayyid Ahmad Bareilly] and Maulvi Mohammad fell on the battle field and the "Islamic State" came to an end.

Professor Abid Husain has used *in toto* the two paragraphs which he devoted to these militant reformers and revivalists in his *The National Culture of India* even in his brochure on *Indian Culture*, forming part of the General Education programme to be imparted to the students of Aligarh Muslim University, where two-thirds of the student-population is Muslim mostly under separatist and largely Pakistani influence! What is worse, he has unwittingly tended to represent in this brochure that their opposition was to the English by bringing in the later thought-complex and the atmosphere of the Muslim theological seminary at Deoband in U.P. as a continuation of the Waliullah movement. He says:<sup>40</sup>

Influenced directly by the Waliullah movement, the religious seminary at Deoband established about 1867 \* became the centre of religious revivalism and of political and cultural opposition to the English.

As stated above, the Nawab of Tonk was a great admirer and helper of Shahid Sayyid Ahmad. It is one of the good points of a frank and open affirmation of a view that it tends to offer sights which otherwise are lost to view, though they may be important for earlier or later history of the topic. Hafeez Malik's standpoint is of this variety and has given us a full glimpse of the activity of the Nawab of Tonk in this affair of Shahid Ahmad's *jihad*. Malik has dwelt, in his appraisal of the militant movement, almost wholly on the doings of the Nawab of Tonk, whose State or kingdom lying between Rai Bareilly and Ameer—a great centre of Muslim veneration containing as it does the tomb of the greatest of Muslim saints in India receiving venerational homage second only to Mecca and Madina—occupied a strategic position. Malik<sup>41</sup> observes:

Among the Moslem princes of India and Afghanistan, Nawab Wazir-ud-Daulah of Tonk was the only one who never failed Shahid and his followers. His greatest contribution, from a historian's point of view, lies in the fact that he had several histories of the nationalist movement written. . . . All these histories are in Persian and have yet to be translated into the national language of India and Pakistan. *The importance of the Nawab's services to the national cause cannot be over-emphasized. With-*

<sup>40</sup> *Indian Culture*, p. 59. Cf. Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *Deoband School etc.*

\* In *The National Culture of India*, Professor Abid Husain has given 1868 as the year of its founding.

<sup>41</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 183-4. Italics mine.

*out him a significant phase in the development of Moslem nationalism would have always remained shrouded in myth and political propaganda.*

The year 1761 is a red-letter one in the annals of India. The new indigenous power, the Marathas, endeavouring to take over the destinies of the country in its hands from those of the Moghuls, who were by then quite effete, was thwarted in its endeavour by a combination of Muslim leaders of Northern India inviting the aid of an external Muslim power for the job, a power that was already ravaging the far western parts of the country in a ruthless manner. The same eventful year registered two events in South India. One was the rise of a new Muslim power. Hyder Ali was made the Commander-in-Chief of the Mysore army by the then weakling monarch of the state in 1761; soon thereafter he usurped royal power and status. The Marathas had defeated the previously existing Muslim power, the Nizam, only a year before. The combined circumstances of a new Muslim power further South, hemming the Marathas on more sides than one and the crushing defeat of the main bulk of their armies at Panipat, afforded full scope for the Nizam to strengthen himself and stand as another undefeated, undaunted Muslim power in the South. The same fateful year, 1761, saw the French handover Pondicherry to the British forces in the South and also the virtual and effective establishment of the British as the foreign power ready and free to meddle in the affairs of the country.<sup>62</sup>

The quadrangular contest that ensued ended as we know about 1800 A.D. in being reduced to a triangular one in name but really a duel between the astute, disciplined and maritime British and the quarrel-ridden, insular and land-locked Marathas.

The new Muslim power of Mysore in the person of Hyder Ali's son Tipu had sought the help of external Muslim power, Turkey, thus continuing the policy of the old Bahamani Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan, only with this difference that whereas the Bahamanis sought the help of the great Persian monarchs of the day, even acknowledging themselves as their vassals as when they agreed to introduce the name of the monarch in their *Khutba* of the Friday prayers, Tipu desired to secure the recognition of his right to the kingdom by the Ottoman Caliph.<sup>63</sup>

It is said of Yusuf Adil Shah of Bijapur (1489-1510 A.D.) that he was "the first militant Shiah ruler in India".<sup>64</sup> However, the employment of foreign soldiers, Persians, Turks and Tartars in the armies of the Deccan Muslim

<sup>62</sup> Lewin B. Bowring, *Haider Ali and Tipu Sultan*, 1899, pp. 31-33, J. D. B. Gribble, *A History of the Deccan*, Vol. II, 1924, pp. 58-82, Mohabbul Hasan Khan, *History of Tipu Sultan*, 1951, p. 8, *The Cambridge Shorter History*, p. 555.

<sup>63</sup> Azaz Ahmad, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-3, Mohabbul Hasan Khan, *History of Tipu Sultan*, pp. 132-39, 378-79, H. K. Sherwani, *The Bahamanis of the Deccan*, 326-7.

<sup>64</sup> *The Cambridge Shorter History*, p. 289.

kingdoms dated back almost a century before this Bijapur monarch. In the reign of Ahmad II (1436 A.D.) of Bidar a large number of the foreign Shia Muslims in the army and in the civil employ known as "Ataqis" were massacred owing to the jealousy of the local Sunni Muslims, who were called "Daklins".<sup>65</sup>

Yusuf Adil Shah is known to have "distributed sixty thousand rupees among holy men and Syeds of Medina, Kerbala and Njaf" on recovery from an illness during a campaign. He also sent money to build a mosque at Sava. The Quth Shahis of Golconda were no less oriented towards Persia and were "more continuously in conflict with the Hindu rulers than the other Muslim kingdoms". Though this determined hostility was partly the result of territorial disputes it was "partly due to the desire of Sultan Quli to disseminate the principles of true faith".<sup>66</sup>

External orientation of these Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan is again stressed by the known disposal of the body of the deceased king of Ahmadnagar Burhan Nizam Shah (1509-1553 A.D.) whose father had established the new kingdom. It was embalmed and sent to Kerbala for internment. During the reign of Murtaza II (1603-30 A.D.) the king sent an embassy to Persia for help against the impending danger of the Moghuls who were bent on extending their suzerainty over the Deccan monarchs, but it was too late and Akbar had already exacted a tribute from Ahmadnagar king making him his vassal in 1601; and the whole kingdom was incorporated into the Moghul Empire of Shahjahan in 1633. The Golconda kingdom was forced to acknowledge suzerainty of the Moghul Emperor and to discontinue the reading of the *Khutba* in the name of the Persian monarch and to substitute that of the Emperor by Aurangzeb, in 1656. Shahjahan had reduced Bijapur to vassalage in 1636 till which time it would appear the *Khutba* there was read in the name of the Persian monarch.<sup>67</sup> Yet the foreign-orientation of these Deccan Muslim States had not ceased. It is stated that both Golconda and Bijapur received their inspiration to meddle in the Moghul war of succession in 1657-8, and later to fight Aurangzeb, from their Persian mentors.<sup>68</sup>

The Muslim monarchs of Delhi on the whole had proved more independent and therefore Indian nationalists. It was mostly among the pre-Moghul kings that we come across solicitude to seek recognition from and to name in the *khutba* foreign Muslim monarchs. Thus Mahmud of Gazna Altamsh had received recognition from the Caliphs of Baghdad and both Muhammad Tughlaq and Firoz Shah Tughlaq had secured it from the

<sup>65</sup> John Norman Hollister, *The Shia of India*, 1953, pp. 104-05, H. K. Sherwani, *The Bahamanis of the Deccan*, 1953, pp. 180-2; 191-2.

<sup>66</sup> Hollister, *ibid.*, pp. 112-3; 120-22

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 116-9; *The Shorter Cambridge History of India*, pp. 374-5, 403.

<sup>68</sup> Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

Caliphs of Egypt.<sup>69</sup> With the Moghuls, Central Asian, Persian, Ottoman nobles, litterateurs and adventurers made their way in the Court and in almost all official walks of life; and we are told that the Persian and other Muslim element in the Court of Akbar acted as a ballast to steady or slow down the speed and rate of Indianization or Hinduization programme begun by the Emperor. With Jahangir the Persian influence became much more powerful but Shahjahan preferred the Turanis (Central Asian). Yet the balance between the Iranis and Turanis in Shahjahan's reign was such as not to lead to trouble. In the reign of Aurangzeb the latter party gained ascendancy. Diplomatic exchanges with Muslim countries of Persia, Turkey etc. which were common in the reign of Shahjahan became rare in that of Aurangzeb owing to hostile intrigues on both sides. Never, however, was the *khutba* of the Friday prayer said in the name of anyone but the Emperor in the reigns of these monarchs.<sup>70</sup>

The greater foreign orientation of the Deccan Muslim monarchs approximating their rule to domination of a foreign power with moorings outside the country was reflected in the state of affairs that prevailed at the beginning of the 19th century in Haiderabad, the Nizam having Muslim-foreigners in his soldiery and a foreign potentate in the person of the Sultan of Hadramawut as a small nobleman of his court.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>69</sup> M. H. Khan, *History of Tipu Sultan*, p. 132.

<sup>70</sup> Ahmad, *op cit.*, pp. 45-7

<sup>71</sup> Ahmad, *op cit.*, p. 54.

## CHAPTER

### 8

## THE SO-CALLED HINDU MUSLIM FUSION IN ART AND ARCHITECTURE

Wherever men have, in recent history, attempted to snatch at political salvation, it is truth which has always been the first casualty, since of all the causes of human turmoil, facts are the most obvious, and are therefore the first to be suppressed.\*

KENNETH MINOGUE<sup>1</sup>

DR TARA CHAND,<sup>1</sup> prefacing his conclusions regarding Indian architecture during and after the Muslim period of Indian history, with a resume of socio-religious background and of aesthetic philosophy, which form the bases of Greek, Islamic and Hindu architectures, remarks:

Hindu and Muslim elements coalesced to form a new type of architecture. The buildings erected by the Muslims for religious, civil or military purposes were not purely Muslim-Syro-Egyptian, Persian or Central Asian nor were the Hindu buildings, temples or palaces or cenotaphs purely Hindu.

Expanding the views further, states that "arcuated /made by means of arches/ form, plain domes, smooth-faced walls, and spacious interiors were Muslim" contributions and concludes: "The artistic quality of the buildings erected since the thirteenth century whether by Hindus or by Muslims is the same."

Seeking support for his thesis in the writings of experts on Indian architecture and finding that the greatest student of comparative architecture of the world, James Fergusson, a first-rate student of Indian architecture, with his keen and as between Hindu and Muslim dispassionate—eye had carefully pronounced his verdict which militated against a significant part of his thesis, Dr Tara Chand catches hold of a worm-eaten reed available in some of the exuberant, highly sentimental and even unbalanced views

\* Kenneth Minogue, *The Liberal Mind*, 1963, p. 202.

<sup>1</sup> *Influence of Islam on Indian Culture*, pp. 243-4. Italics mine.

of E. B. Havell.

Dr Tara Chand evidently wants to complete his appraisal of the give and take, his affirmation of the identical artistic quality of Hindu and Muslim buildings with the declaration that "*in the mediaeval art of India -- [I take it that by art Dr Tara Chand means the art of architecture which alone is the topic in the context] -- the effect of Muslim impact was to transform the ancient Hindu aesthetic values.*" But he knew that James Fergusson and J. Burgess, almost 30 years before the publication of Dr Tara Chand's book in 1936, had very sedately derived the Indian Muslim mosque from the architectural form of a Jaina temple and though Dr Tara Chand does not mention it, Fergusson had carefully indicated the elements of Muslim architecture in India, which were derived from Hindu origins as also the more or less precise step or steps in the process of the modifications. He defers the above-mentioned conclusion to soften the shock and introduces between the two portions a longish quotation from Havell's work, calculated to buttress his position, and then only states Fergusson's considered views going against him, to knock them out with a simple and a sweeping assertion of his own.

E. B. Havell, working in Calcutta and entertaining a fine sentiment for things Indian, was irked by the attitude of most British officials including engineers, architects or students of art, which looked with condescension on Indian art and made too much of the differences between the Hindus and the Muslims, desired to put the extreme opposite point of view. In doing this he harshly rated Fergusson and his architectural judgments. Carried away by his desire to prove that the Muslims owed almost all their architectural achievements in India to the Hindu tradition and its Hindu practitioners, and also that the so-called bigotry of the Muslim monarchs did not interfere with matters purely architectural, he contradicts with rancorous expression Fergusson's considered opinion about the arch and the dome of Islamic architecture in India. He demurs to Fergusson's view that Islamic architecture in India has to be distinguished as, or rather that "it differentiates itself into", more than half a dozen schools or styles, and combats with vehemence both his classification and his partial derivation of the differences from the differing external sources of their inspiration. Stated in bare seriatim terms Havell denies

1. that there are different regional styles in the architecture of Muslim India;
2. that Muslim monarchs in different parts of India were influenced in their architectural undertakings by different or outside Islamic centres;
3. that Hindus derived their later facility with and readiness for the use of the dome and the arch from their active participation in putting these architectural elements of primary Islamic derivation to

effectively satisfying use in the Islamic structures of their Muslim masters.

Havell's contention that there are no regional styles in Muslim architecture in India is flatly rejected by a more recent and more painstaking yet sympathetic student of Indian architecture, Percy Brown, in the scheme of his work *Indian Architecture*. Brown first of all separates the Hindu including Buddhist architecture in one volume, though he names it as *Buddhist and Hindu Period*. As Brown describes in that volume, Hindu temples of even the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, reserving only the Indian Hindu palaces of the 17th and 18th centuries to be dealt with in the other volume of the work which he names as *Indian Architecture (Islamic Period)*, it is clear that what is intended by the division into two separate volumes is in terms of Hindu and Muslim architecture. Secondly, Brown is so convinced of the scientific nature of Fergusson's classification of the "styles", a word which is anathema to Havell that he has given a fine map of India in pl. XX of his volume *Islamic Period* demarcating clearly the various Muslim kingdoms and their styles, and has named it "India, Indo-Islamic Architecture, Regions of Provincial Styles". The only departure in this naming from the classification of Fergusson is that Brown describes this architecture as "Indo-Islamic" as against Fergusson's "Indian Saracenic" or, for short, Indo-Saracenic. In favour of Fergusson it can be said, apart from the fact that Fergusson wrote almost a century ago, that even such a nationalist Bengali Muslim as Professor Humayun Kabir,<sup>2</sup> writing a few years after Brown's work was published, uses the term Saracenic to denote the outside architectural "styles" which "influenced old Indian traditions" which "in their turn profoundly affected the character of Muslim architecture in India".

Brown names Delhi style very logically as the Imperial Style and devotes four chapters to it in terms of the ruling dynasties and describes the Provincial Styles in nine separate chapters, one each under the name of the particular province, devoting to each a whole chapter, two chapters or a part of a chapter. Brown<sup>3</sup> speaks of the Imperial style as "the architectural system that had been gradually forming under the Sultans at Delhi," and states that "owing to its forceful nature" it was "influencing to a greater or lesser degree the provincial manifestations as they arose". About Gujarat style he observes: "... it is not remarkable that of all the provincial styles which emerged under Islamic rule, that which flourished in Gujarat is the most indigenously Indian". The most outstanding characteristic of the Jaunpur style he<sup>4</sup> affirms is "the pylon formation" of the mosque facade "recalling the propylon of some [Ancient] Egyptian temples". The distinc-

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 96. Italics mine.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 45, 67.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 40-1.



tion of the Malwa style from that of the nearby Gujarat one comes out in the comparison instituted between the Jami Masjid at Ahmedabad finished about 1423 A.D. and the Jami Masjid at Mandu completed in 1440 A.D. Brown<sup>5</sup> remarks: "Nothing could throw a stronger light on *the difference in character that developed between certain of these provincial styles* than a comparison of this mosque [at Mandu] with the Jami Masjid of Ahmedabad."

Before passing on to the second point on which count Havell has rated Fergusson, I would like to mention what Havell himself has to write about Muslim architecture in a manner which quite clearly suggests and posits regional differentiation of a fairly pronounced order. Thus Havell<sup>6</sup> observes about the Muslim architecture of Bahamani and post-Bahamani period:

Nearly all of the characteristics which distinguish the buildings of Bijapur from the earlier Hindu-Muslim schools of Malwa and Kulbarga [Gulbarga], were derived from the Hindu tradition of Southern India. Those which belong exclusively to Bijapur were the result of further experiment after the fall of Vijayanagar. *The South Indian builders as soon as they had adopted the arch as a structural expedient* began to experiment with it even more boldly than their craft brethren in the north had done. . . . The 'largeness and grandeur' of the Bijapur style came from this indigenous creative impulse, not from Persia or from Turkey.

Let us see what Havell has to say about Muslim architecture of Malwa, which, according to him, is the work of Hindu-Muslim school not unlike early Deccan-Bijapur work.

Asserting that both in Jaunpur - /therefore in a provincial style!/-and Malwa there were "marked developments in Muhammadan building craft, though in different directions", Havell<sup>7</sup> states that at Mandu, the then capital of Malwa, the use of the arch as a structural element came to be extended so that the buildings "*assumed a more decidedly Saracenic or Persian appearance internally as well as externally.*" Further Havell opines that "the buildings of the 15th century show little variation on those of the preceding century". Stating that the Malik Mughl's mosque at Mandu is "a very interesting example of the transition from the trabeate to the arched system of building" he points out the fact that "the capitals of the four corner pillars engaged between the arches are used as brackets to support the base of the dome in the ordinary Hindu method" and maintains that "the eight extra pillars would not have been necessary if arches had not, therefore, be taken as the specimens explaining the genesis of the use

<sup>5</sup> P. 62. Italics mine.

<sup>6</sup> *Indian Architecture*, 1913, pp. 179, 185-6. Italics mine.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 64-5, 78. Italics mine.

hammadan buildings was a solid corner bracket corbelled out of the walls" he tells us that "a rather crude early-fifteenth century application of it can be seen in the Jami Masjid at Mandu".<sup>8</sup>

One must note Havell's disregard of the chronological factor in this that the Bijapur examples of the use of arch, are earlier by a century or a half than those of Malwa-Mandu. The latter, unless otherwise established, cannot, therefore, be taken as the specimens explaining the genesis of the use of arch. Havell's disregard of both the temporal, (as in this instance) and also the spatial, (again as in this instance) in so far as he suggests the importation of some elements of the art from far off Gaur, as well as of the political factor, in not heeding the bitter enmity of the Gujarat Sultans and the Malwa ones in the 15th century, must surely militate against acceptance of his architectural judgments.

Percy Brown,<sup>9</sup> who is equally competent as a student of Indian art, and has taken all these factors into consideration, naturally must command much greater authority for his views. He derives the Mandu architecture from Delhi, particularly featuring items from the Tughlaq structures and some from those of the Lodis. And Delhi besides combining some of the specific features of Hindu architecture with newer elements, characterized by Brown as "a compounding of the structural conventions of both communities as illustrated in the archways of the tomb of Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq", had received Persian inspiration. For in the map of the provincial or regional schools mentioned above he shows it as reaching Delhi.

Brown's<sup>10</sup> comments on the architectural features of the tomb of Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq are very significant in so far as they uphold Fergusson's judgment and ignore completely Havell's impassioned contention as not worthy of serious consideration in regard to the second point of difference between them listed above. Brown, expatiating on the treatment of the arches of this compound of the Hindu trabeate and the Muslim arcuate systems of architecture, derives the modification of the pointed arch without obliterating its feature incorporated in the previous Khilji architecture from Western Asian source. Brown speaks of the pointed variety of the arch itself as "the Islamic pointed arch", indicating clearly that he regards the pointed arch as an Islamic introduction. Incidentally, even Havell<sup>11</sup> himself associates the pointed arch with Islamic architecture as when he remarks about the arched screen of the Ajmir mosque that "naturally enough the mullahs insisted that the pointed arch, *with its symbolic associations for Islam*, should be used for the screen" and even speaks of arches as "the symbols of their [Muslims'] religion".

It was only the sure instinct of a born architect and the profound insight

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 105-7.

<sup>9</sup> *Indian Architecture, Islamic Period*, pp. 18, 59

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 13-14, 18, 47.

<sup>11</sup> *Op cit.*, pp. 44-5. Italics mine

of a deep student of comparative architecture that had enabled Fergusson, almost half a century or more before Havell, to note the distinction in the architectures of the Muslim potentates of Jaunpur to the North-East and Ahmedabad to the West on the one hand, and that of the Muslim monarchs of Mandu—Malwa on the other which implies potent foreign influence in the achievements of the latter. He<sup>12</sup> says:

It is not easy to understand why the architects of Malwa should have adopted a style so essentially arcuate as that which we find in the capital, while their brethren at Jaunpur and Ahmadabad clung so fondly to a trabeate form wherever they had an opportunity of employing it . . . we neither find them borrowing nor imitating, but adhering steadily to *the pointed-arch style, which is the essential characteristic of their art in foreign countries.*

Brown,<sup>13</sup> going back to the age of the Indus Valley Civilization for evidence of a true arch in India and finding that there was none such available, concludes that the final step in the creation of a structural arch was never taken. Quoting evidently from Fergusson's work the conviction of the Indian builder that "the arch never sleeps" he observes, ". . . with one or two relatively unimportant exceptions, the true arch is never found in any indigenous building in India, *not appearing in the country until introduced by the invading Muhammadans in the thirteenth century*". If Fergusson<sup>14</sup> sixty years earlier made the same categorical pronouncement without mentioning the two minor exceptions, and added the statement that the Hindus did not employ a true arch in their structures "for centuries afterwards", one need not accuse him of any obtuseness or obsession as Havell,<sup>15</sup> in his passionate advocacy of a sentimental view, implies.

Dome is another architectural feature which is so characteristically associated with Muslim sacred and semi-sacred architecture, mosques and Mausolea. Fergusson, drawing his conclusions from the buildings that were in all probability existing when Babur, coming from that Muslim region, invaded India, states that the bulbous dome was in evidence everywhere in that region, though it was not known at that time in India "unless it was in the quasi-Persian province of Sindh".<sup>16</sup> Havell<sup>17</sup> quoting this judgment opposes it with his assertion that "the bulbous dome was common in India, Buddhist and Hindu buildings centuries before it appears in Persia in Saracenic buildings, and that most typical feature of Mogul architecture was certainly not first introduced into India by Muhammadan builders".

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 253. Italics mine.

<sup>13</sup> *Indian Architecture, Buddhist and Hindu Period*, p. 53. Italics mine.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, pp. 310-11; II, 203-4.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 15, 52-3, 57, 66, 88-89, 91, 113, 155, 178-9.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 286.

<sup>17</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 16, 72-3, 91, 93, 134, 155-6, 186-8.

Havell has not produced a single example of a structural dome, either Buddhist or Hindu, and yet he speaks not only of these but distinguishes a variety of the latter as Dravidian. What he has instanced are the domical roofings either in the rock-cut "viharas" of the Buddhist or the stone, solid or scooped out, finials of South Indian temples. The example of the so-called elephant stables of Vijayanagar as forerunners of the Bijapur domes proves nothing. For the so-called elephant stable is quite logically believed to have been a mosque. Further the adoption of Muslim architectural features and their adaptation and refinement by the early 16th century Vijayanagar craftsmen being responsible for the structure only goes to substantiate Fergusson's thesis.

It is necessary to mention at this stage that the remark of Fergusson quoted and controverted by Havell, though rather general, must be considered to apply only to bulbous or Tartar or ribbed domes and not to domes in general. For in his introductory observations in the second Chapter of the third Book of the 1st volume of his book (pp. 314-19) Fergusson has not only made a detailed statement of the mode of constructing the roof by pre-Muslim Indians but has also instanced the earliest of the dome-roofs in pre-Muslim India, viz., that on the porch of the Jaina temple of Vimala at Mt. Abu, built in about 1050 A.D. Stating also the dimensional limits of pre-Muslim and post-Muslim Hindu or Jaina domes as not exceeding 30 ft. in diameter, he praised them as against both the Roman and Byzantine domes. Reviewing the horizontal ornamentation of these domes he observes: "This arrangement allows of far more variety without any offence to good taste, and practically has rendered *some of the Indian domes the most exquisite specimens of elaborate roofing that can anywhere be seen.*"\* He has even brought in the great Wren's work for comparison only to emphasize the superiority of the Hindu work. Thus, referring to the church of St. Stephen's, Wallbrook, he says: "This church is the great architect's masterpiece, but it would have been greatly improved had its resemblance to a Hindu porch been more complete." And all the Hindu and even Jaina domes are roofings either of the porch or the "mandap".

Further reviewing the Hindu and Jaina temples of the 8th 9th century Rajasthan, Fergusson<sup>18</sup> says:

As before mentioned, the Buddhists, though employing circular roofs, and in all ages building topes with domical forms externally, do not seem to have attempted an internal dome, in stone at least. It is a feature of both Hindu and Jaina architecture, and is specially prevalent among the northern Jains, though why this particular sect should have adopted it, and why they should have persevered in using it through so long a period.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 56-7.

are questions we are not yet in a position to answer.\* It was an essential feature in the architecture of the Muslims before they came into India, and consequently they eagerly seized on the domes of the Hindus and Jains when they first arrived there, and afterwards from them worked out that domical style which is one of the most marked characteristics of their art in India.

Commenting on the architecture of the Jaina temples of the 16th and 17th centuries in North India, however, Fergusson<sup>19</sup> observes:

Many of the temples here are surmounted by the bulbous dome of the Mughals. The true native "sikhara" rarely appears, but a modified form of it is prevalent, and the openings almost invariably take the form of the Muhammadan foliated pointed arch. . . *The result is picturesque, but not satisfactory when looked at closely into, and generally the details want the purity and elegance that characterized the earlier examples.*

Nearly thirty years after Havell's attack on Fergusson, and his rather sentimental championship of Hindu-Jaina claim to have supplied most of the architectural elements, and not merely skill, to the Muslim for his architecture in India, and the still more sentimental and impassioned plea to see in almost everything Muslim a clear and fine synthesis of whatever separateness existed in the architecture of pre-Muslim India with the few specialities of Islamic tradition, Percy Brown equally competent as an art student but much more sedate, scientific and painstaking than Havell, in the width of the newer knowledge and in the depth of the urge of the newer national impulse, affirms in unequivocal terms the general correctness of Fergusson's views on this point. Observes Brown:<sup>20</sup> "The appearance of the arch in the building construction of Islam may be traced to the contact of the early Muhammadans with the architectural developments of the post-Roman period." Further dilating on the scientific and mechanical formulae which the Muslims brought into India, Brown says regarding the change in the total appearance of the Indian landscape:

Hitherto the "sky-line" of the buildings took the form of flat or low pointed roofs and the spire or shikara. With the Muhammedans came an entirely new shape, the dome, so that there was a change from the pyramidal to the ovoid and before long the characteristic architectural feature of many of the cities and towns and even the villages was the white bulbous dome.

\* As far as I have been able to ascertain, the position is no better to-day. To this rather discreditable situation in the field of knowledge Havell's mystification and wrong direction must have contributed not a little!

<sup>19</sup> Vol. II, p. 62. Italics mine.

<sup>20</sup> *Indian Architecture, Islamic Period*, pp. 2, 18.

Commenting on the tomb of Ghiyasuddin Tughluq he observes:

The dome itself denotes an interesting stage in the evolution of this important feature in the building art of the country, both with regard to its shape as well as its construction. It is a single dome, that is to say it has not empty space between its inner and outer surfaces, and in design it is of the pointed or "tatar" shape the type afterwards to become characteristic of the Indo-Islamic style as a whole.

We shall now examine the actual examples, and shall begin with Havell's first and foremost comparison or as, he would have put it, the "Hindu prototype", though a contemporary one, of the Muslim dome in India. Havell<sup>21</sup> has obliged his readers, that is, those who would like to look into the subject a little more deeply than Dr Tara Chand has done, by insisting on the contemporaneity of the Jami Masjid at Ahmedabad in Gujarat and the Jain temple at Ranpur or Ranakpur in Jodhpur Division about 35 miles north of Udaipur.

Informing his readers that the temple was built by Kumbha Rana—a distortion of Fergusson's correct statement that it was built during the reign of Kumbha Rana, with the addition in the footnote of the further detail that it was built by a Jaina named Dharanaka in 1439 A.D."—he laments the fact that there are no better photographs—he leaves out altogether the plan, the elevation and section of the structure—than the one reproduced by Fergusson. Havell pleads "his inability to demonstrate the identity of the two schools of architectural design, Jaina or Hindu and Muslim. He states, however, that "several of the domes of the Hindu [Jain] temple are on the exterior 'Muhammadan'—i.e., they are not sculptured in the Hindu style, but are brought to an even surface by cement and fine plaster in the same way as the domes of Muhammadan mosques."

As against Havell's opinion I should place the view of Burgess, a stalwart of Indian Archaeology and particularly so of Western India. Burgess, mentioning this Jaina temple of Ranpur (Sadri) along with the Jami Masjid built by Alimad Shah almost contemporaneously at Ahmedabad about 160 miles away, remarks that they "serve to illustrate *the Jaina or Hindu style as employed simultaneously for its own and for a foreign purpose*."<sup>22</sup>

Percy Brown<sup>23</sup> has given us what appears to be another photograph of the Chaumukh temple at Ranpur and has reproduced the plan made by

<sup>21</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 68-9, 71-3, 131, 133-4.

<sup>22</sup> We know the architect's name to have been Depaka from an inscription of 1439 A.D. describing the structure as "Chaturmukhavihara"—see *Journal of Indian History*, 1957, p. 329.

<sup>23</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 73, 145.

<sup>24</sup> *Archaeological Survey of Western India VII, Muhammadan Architecture of Ahmedabad*, Part I (1900), p. 32. Italics mine.

<sup>25</sup> *Indian Architecture, Buddhist and Indian Period*, Pl. XV, p. 161.

Cousens and already printed by Fergusson in his book. Fergusson's own sketch of a nearer view of the temple from within is not reproduced, nor even mentioned, by Havell or Brown. Brown's better photograph, I must reluctantly mention, does not evoke a description of the temple, either fuller or better. Nay, in parts it is actually misleading to anyone who has not read his Fergusson. Thus he speaks of "rounded cupolas" and later only mentions them by their proper nomenclature as "ovoid domes". He writes as if all the domes are of equal dimension and omits to specify the large dome which figures in the sketch made and published by Fergusson, and which raises its head in its proper place as the roofing of the porch, just in front of the sanctum and its "shikhara". This is particularly a defect in the context of the size of Muslim domes in India and of the earliest so far extant dome of the Jains. Whereas the smaller domes are each 21.5 ft. in diameter, the large one is 31 ft. in that dimension as Fergusson<sup>26</sup> states. Fergusson's description of the Chaumukh temple, again, is so complete that I think Havell's suggestion is unfair to him. Brown has not even come up to Fergusson, though writing sixty-six years after him!

The Jain temples of North India of an earlier age reproduced in Fergusson's book or in Brown's book do not show such a forest of domes. Generally each temple has one big dome over the porch, only a compound temple having more than one. This means that in the architecture of Ranpur temple Muslim influence was effectively at work.

The Jains had erected a temple with a dome or domes about 400 years before this temple at Ranpur which Havell either forgot to take note of or ignored. The Jain temple which has this feature of a dome is also one of the more famous ones. It is Vimala temple of Mt. Abu built in 1031 A.D. By its side is the Tejpal temple built between 1230 and 1236 A.D., i.e., full two centuries later. Both these temples are famed for the sculptured beauty of their domes, each having only one over its porch. The dome of Vimala temple, which is slightly bigger than that of the other, measures only 25 ft. in diameter.<sup>27</sup>

The earliest of Hindu temples to have a domed "mandapa", or porch, appears to be the ruined, yet a beauty in its ruins, temple of Amwa, "near Ajanta" in Madhya Pradesh, sketched by Fergusson.<sup>28</sup> The dome which is only 21 ft. in diameter has evoked great encomium from Fergusson. He says: "Like all Indian [Hindu-Jain] domes, it is horizontal in construction, and consequently also in ornamentation, but as that is done here, it is as elegant or more so than the ribbed domes of western art." It appears to

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 44-8.

<sup>27</sup> Brown, *Buddhist and Hindu Period*, p. 143

<sup>28</sup> Fergusson, II, pp 56-7 and illustration 294. P. Brown specifies the locality as in Kotah territory. Archaeological Survey reported what appears to me to be from its description, another temple, a structure at Amwa in Sojat District, in to the West of this Amwa or Ambar, in Jodhpur territory (*Progress Rep. Arch. Surv. of Ind., W. Circle*, 1915, p. 80).

have been put up in the third quarter of the 10th century A.D. The Sachiyamata temple of Jodhpur, also with a dome on the "mandapa" is slightly later.\*

The temple of Somanath, which, even in its ruinous condition, illustrates according to Fergusson "the style employed by the Jains in Gujarat in the 12th century", is another specimen of a Hindu temple with a dome, roofing its "mandapa". The dome measures 33 ft. in its diameter.<sup>29</sup>

It is clear from a study of the existing specimens of Jain and Hindu temples that before the actual impact of Muslim rule the horizontal dome was effectively used both structurally and sculpturally but only to roof the "mandapa" or the porch of the temple. And there is no evidence of multiple domes on a temple before the Muslim rule had stabilized itself during two centuries and put up a number of domes and multi-domed structures, mosques and mausolea. Its use in the Hindu temples was very much less common and appears to have been largely abandoned with the incoming of the Muslims and the appearance of the domes in the country. For the same Kumbha Rana (1418-1468 A.D.) whose Jain subject built the temple at Raipur, in the temple of Vishnu which he built for his wife, had the kind of pyramidal roof as is seen on most North Indian Hindu temples of the 11th to the 13th century, to roof its "mandapa" or portico. Fergusson<sup>30</sup> remarks:

. . . taking all in all [the temple] certainly is more like an ancient temple than any other of its age I am acquainted with. It was a revival, the last expiring effort of a style that was dying out, in that form at last.

This last observation of Fergusson should have warned Dr Tara Chand against making statements of the kind he has made about the fusion or synthesis between the Hindu and Muslim styles of architecture for use in Hindu temples. It should also have sent him searching further to examine more carefully his facile observation about the Hindu acceptance of Muslim cultural creations. For Kumbha Rana was the lineal ascendant of the house of Chitod that held out against the Muslims longest in North India, and perhaps the only one who, as history knows, defeated a Muslim army in North India after the establishment of the Muslim rule, the famous Tower of Fame at Chitod being claimed as his erection in celebration of his victory.

Fergusson's<sup>31</sup> deep knowledge and profound insight had already prompted him in the course of his comments on the cenotaphs of later Udaipur monarchs to observe:

\* See my *Rajput Architecture*, 1968.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, II, p. 38.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, II, p. 150.

<sup>31</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 167, *Italics mine*.



These last two illustrations [cenotaphs of the first quarter of the 18th century], it will be observed, are practically in the Jaina style of architecture; for, though adopting a Muhamadan form [of the cenotaph], *the Ranas of Udaypur clung to the style of architecture which their ancestors had practised, and which under Kumbha Rana had only recently become so famous.*

We thus see that Havell's fulmination against Fergusson in the matter of both the arch and the dome and his objection to his classification of Indo-Muslim architecture into a number of regional styles, most of them incorporating in various proportions one or the other of the two outside influences, Persian or Turkoman, in the slightly differing local Hindu styles, are uncalled for and invalid. And Dr Tara Chand's main support in some of his assertions regarding Hindu and Muslim architectural fusion falls to the ground!

Let me introduce the reader to Fergusson's actual views as they are presented in the revised edition of 1910 of his famous book; and he will find for himself how Dr Tara Chand moves tortuously to find some support for his preconceived notions by either misunderstanding the views or by misrepresenting them or by both the processes. Observes Fergusson:<sup>32</sup> "The process by which this conversion of a Jaina temple to a Muslim mosque was effected will be easily understood by referring to the plan of Vimala [temple] on Mount Abu." He describes the three modifications, which made could turn the temple into an appropriate mosque, the fourth modification being the re-creation of the larger pillars and the dome of the porch in the centre of the court in place of the principal cella and its porch of the temple. Finally he concludes:

Thus, without a single new column or carved stone being required, they obtained a mosque *which, for convenience and beauty, was unsurpassed by anything they afterwards erected from their original designs.*

This paragraph which ends Fergusson's chapter on "Modern Jaina Style" (Vol. II, IV) and the section on "Converted Temple" is preceded by three paragraphs giving examples of mosques which, according to Fergusson, were formerly Jain temples and later converted by the Muslims into mosques. He<sup>32</sup> begins with the earliest works, those of Qutbuddin Aibak, one at Delhi and the other at Ajmir. The latter building is characteristically known as "Adhaidin ka Jhompda", hut of two-and-a-half-days. Fergusson, evidently depending on Col. Tod's description of it as a Jaina temple and on the picture of it given by him, was led to conclude in the way he did. Percy Brown's description of the structure and his estimate, too, make it a new "compilation of Hindu materials" in which "increased

<sup>32</sup> *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, II, pp. 68-9. Italics mine.

height was obtained by superimposing not two, but three of the Hindu shafts to form each pillar." What Fergusson has asserted is not that the Jaina temple plan developed into the plan of the Muslim mosque as Dr Tara Chand tells his readers but that a Jaina temple was, or Jain temples were, turned into a mosque, or mosques, with the help of appropriate modifications.

To the Ajmir mosque I shall add the one at Kaman, an ancient town, not very far from Ajmer, about thirty-nine miles to the north-west of Mathura, which is an example of the same process. The mosque at Kaman known as Chaunsat Khamba Masjid is one of the oldest in India and is on the same plan as the Adhai-din-ka-Jhonpra of Ajmir. And like it, "it is built entirely of materials obtained from Hindu temples".<sup>33</sup>

To buttress his thesis Dr Tara Chand,<sup>34</sup> describing the temple of Vastupal and Tejpal at Girnar (1230 A.D.) as "the last great monument of Hindu architecture", states that "no building of great importance was erected [by Hindus] in Northern India" for about two centuries. When, after a sort of an equilibrium was established at the beginning of the 15th century, building activity of Hindus and Jains began, it was open to them either to follow and thus revive "the ancient Hindu style whose examples were still standing around them in Rapputana and in Bundelkhand" or to adopt "the new Hindu-Muslim style which the Muslim patrons and Hindu artists had combined to create". Dr Tara Chand affirms that "they wisely or perhaps inevitably chose the latter course". It may be noted here, to emphasize the waywardness of Dr Tara Chand's method, that neither Fergusson (II 34) who gives the ground plan of this temple of Ranpur, nor Percy Brown (I 159) who describes it almost fully, has anything much by way of praise of its architectural quality, while both of them say a good deal in favour of the temple of Tejpal of Mt. Abu, so well known for its magnificent dome.

In support of his statement and thesis that the Hindus adopted the Indo-Muslim style of architecture as it was formed by the end of the 14th century Dr Tara Chand instances the temple at Ranpur, mentioned and somewhat described above, and among secular buildings Rana Kumbha's palace at Chitod and Rana Man Singh's palace at Gwalior.

It is very instructive to note that Dr Tara Chand should have chosen Chaumukh temple at Ranpur near Sadri in Jodhpur territory and forgotten or ignored its contemporary the Vaishnava temple at Chitod which was put up by Rana Kumbha, and not by any Hindu or Jain subject of his as was the temple at Ranpur, or the so-called Mirabai's temple of the same date standing close by the famous Ekalingaji temple. D. R. Bhandarkar<sup>35</sup> tells us that Mirabai's temple resembles the Ekalingaji temple and that the

<sup>33</sup> *Progress Repd., Arch. Sur. of India*, W. Cucle, 1919, p. 64.

<sup>34</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp 244-5, 245-48.

<sup>35</sup> *Progress Report, Archaeological Survey of Western India*, for 1905, p. 60.

latter was renovated in 1439 A.D. by Khumbha's son. Dr Prem Lata Sharma <sup>36</sup> informs us that what is known as Mirabai's temple is really the Adiyaraha temple, dedicated to Visnu's boar-incarnation, built by Kumbha. Bhandarkar describes the renovated temple of Ekalingaji as "beautiful and imposing".

I have said enough about these temples and have adduced also adequate support from competent students of Indian architecture to demonstrate the utter inadequacy and partiality of Dr Tara Chand's views. At best one can assert that the Jains, as evidenced by the Ranpur temple, adopted and incorporated in their sacred architecture some of the features of Indo-Muslim architecture. The Hindus, on the other hand, must be considered to have remained impervious to its blandishments, unless one can instance a temple showing such features. And no history of Indian architecture, neither the comprehensive book of Fergusson, nor the frankly propagandist one of Havell, nor again the systematic and later compendium of Percy Brown, noting and listing temples and mosques by dates and regions, has provided any such example. For, after the 13th century, except for the brief episode of resurgent Rajput Hinduism of Rana Kumbha and his successor, or of the tactful Tomara Chief of Gwalior, a generation after Rana Kumbha, North India was lying low, almost dead till the tolerant regime of Akbar about the middle of the 16th century revived it for a while.

At this stage it is necessary and desirable to examine the thesis of a hiatus or quietus in North Indian, particularly in Rajasthani cultural and architectural activity, put up by Professor Abid Husain. As a preliminary, to facilitate easy comprehension of the criticism that I have to make I shall first briefly summarize the views of Professor Kabir and Professor Husain both of whom wrote some years after Dr Tara Chand's book was published and were evidently influenced by it.

Professor Kabir <sup>37</sup> tells his readers that the Hindu temple on the outside "luxuriates in form. Not an inch of empty space is to be found anywhere. The unbounded opulence of detail and ornament serves to manifest the real which is the transcendental totality of all forms. The shrine inside on the other hand is a small dark cell with scarcely one ray of light. There the soul of man must stand alone, face to face with the eternal mystery." Evidently referring to mediaeval times he informs his readers that instances of a purely Hindu style are to be found mainly in the South and that in northern India "palaces, forts and tombs" all show "traces of Persian influence". However, features alien to Persian models and proclaiming "their basis in the traditions of ancient India" are present. "In the temples of the south, it is the straight line which dominates.... Another striking feature ... is the exuberance of its sculptural decoration.... The aim of this architecture seems to be to overwhelm our minds through

<sup>36</sup> *Sangitaraj* by Maharana Kumbha, Vol. I (1963), p. 63

<sup>37</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 93-6. *Italics mine.*

an abundance of form and splendour." The northern temples he avers 'have broken away from the domination of the straight line. *They exhibit a composition of the arch and the circle which subtly transform the atmosphere.*' If domes are "rare" the "turrets" themselves "are different from those of the south". And all this philosophy of Hinduism and of Hindu religious architecture is designed finally to lead to the one conclusion, the one desideratum for Professor Kabir, that "*the finest structures of the north—whether mosque or temple—are informed by a spirit of harmony and fusion of the two [Hindu and Muslim] styles*". Professor Kabir further asserts that "this synthesis" was "achieved even in the case of temple architecture", "economy of sculpture and other decoration in the north" not being "a mere accident". The characteristics of this fused style are thus eloquently and enthusiastically characterized by him:

Hindu and Muslim coalesce to form a new type of architecture. The severity of Muslim architecture is mellowed down and *the plastic exuberance of Hindu art curtailed. The Sarcenic emphasis on harmony and form is blended with the Indian emphasis on splendour and decoration.*

Professor Abid Husain in his *National Culture of India*<sup>38</sup> speaks of "three hundred years after Harsha" as "a period of political disintegration and stagnation", the "degeneration" dating from the time when the invading Shakas, Hunas and Gurjaras put an end to Gupta empire and settled in India. By the 11th century, having got themselves recognized as Rajputs, "these nomads" "infused fresh blood into the enervated body of Hindu society and created a new stir and movement in its stagnant intellectual and cultural life"; and their "courts became centres of art, literature, poetry and drama". He instances the activity of Raja Bhoj of Malwa in this connection, who, he informs his readers, "through his patronage of art and learning" "revived the memory of the Gupta emperors", though he specially mentions only one "noted dramatist" Shekhar [Rajasekhara] and that too as patronised by a king of Kanauj who lived before Raja Bhoj. To complete Husain's account of the Rajput "regeneration" of Indian culture I shall leave out his short tour of Kashmir and note that he mentions Chanda Bardai's work *Prithvi Raj Rasu* "written at the instance of the Chaulhan Raja of Ajmer" as written in "Dingal Hindi". Further Professor Husain remarking that "architecture, too, made great progress under the Rajputs", instances the forts of Chittor, Ranthambor, Mandu and Gwalior and "the temples in Khajuraho (Bundelkhand) and Bhuvaneshwar". Finally he pronounces this Rajput-generated culture to be "the culture of a warlike people in an age of chivalry", who being "obsessed with tribal consciousness" "seemed to have lost even a sense of solidarity of class or caste to say nothing of the sense of national unity".

<sup>38</sup> 1961 ed., pp. 69-72.

Professor Husain sees in the establishment of the Delhi Sultanate in the 13th century "a rallying point" for the "cultural forces of Islam". The Islamic character of the Delhi Sultanate is established by the fact of its having been under "the nominal suzerainty" of the Khalifa, the Lodis and Suri dynasties, the last of the Sultanate showing their allegiance in their coinage. Husain, however, maintains that the Sultanate did not behave as a truly Islamic state, though the Muslims who formed "the bulk of the army on which the Sultan depended for maintaining his rule" being his co-religionists were "on the whole treated better than non-Muslims".<sup>99</sup>

As for architecture in this period Professor Husain says: "the process of blending" which in spite of the conscious efforts of some great souls could not be carried out in the field of religion was effected almost unconsciously in architecture. In the very first century of the Delhi Sultanate according to him a "Hindu-Muslim style of architecture had come into being" which was used in the next century, the 14th, by Muslim kings of Bengal, Gujarat and the Deccan and also by the Hindu Rajas of Bundelkhand and Rajputana. In this connection Professor Husain ascribes to Fergusson a view which Fergusson did not propound; and the attribution must be due to Husain's enthusiastic haste combined with the little misguidance that an admiring reader of Dr Tara Chand's book like Professor Husain is bound to receive.

About the Jami Masjid at Ajmer erected by the first Sultans Professor Husain says: "Fergusson has pointed out that the design of the Jama Masjid in Ajmer has been taken from the Jain temple on Mount Abu." About the Delhi mosque of the Sultans, the Quwatul-Islam mosque, Professor Husain asserts that "it was actually built on the site of a Jain temple out of its debris". Though Professor Husain speaks of a Hindu-Muslim style of architecture as having been formed "in the very first century of the Delhi Sultanate" yet he has to admit that "its consummation in a perfectly harmonious style required the originality of mind and the breadth of vision of the Moghul Emperors". And evidently "the originality" and "the breadth" were according to him shown by the first two Moghul Emperors by bringing "with them a *purely Persian taste in architecture as well as Persian architects*". The structures put up by Babur and Humayun as also by Akbar early in his career "are in the style of the medieval buildings of Isfahan in Persia." Though Akbar as Husain avers attempted "a synthesis of the Turco-Persian Muslim conceptions with the Hindu-Indian and thus created the graceful Moghul style", "the general design of the Jama Masjid in Fatehpur Sikri is taken from that in Isfahan; its imposing lofty gate is a picture of the classical simplicity of medieval Persia. But its domes reveal the influence of the Jain style and so do the domes of the mosques on Mount Abu."

As for Rajas of Bundelkhand and Rajputana making use of the so-called

<sup>99</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 86-7, 88, 94, 95, 107.

Hindu-Muslim style evolved by the Delhi Sultanate, it must be pointed out that most of the temples of the Khajuraho group, of Gwalior, of Osian-Jodhpur, of Gujarat-Kathiawad, of Malwa and also of Maharashtra were put up even before Mahmud of Gazni set his despoiling foot east of the Sutlej.\*

Though Hindu influence is stated to have increased in Jehangir's time, the bringing in of "new architects from Persia and other countries" creating "a fresh wave of foreign influences" is affirmed to have "tended to weaken that of the indigenous Hindu style". However, Professor Husain, whose intention is clearly to assert that the new foreign influence did not affect the already established style significantly, adds a qualifying sentence. He says: "... but it [Hindu style] had, by that time so completely fused itself into what was called the Moghul style that it was impossible to resolve this organic whole into its constituents". Yet in the course of his encomium of the new material patronized by Shahjahan, marble, he informs his readers that "the Moghul architecture acquired new qualities which neither the Persian nor the old Indian styles had ever possessed" and adds: "*The cooperation of the Indian mind with the Persian . . . created a new style in which the various elements are so completely blended into a harmonious whole, that now their analysis into Indian and foreign, even if it were possible, would have no sense.*"<sup>10</sup>

Culture described by Professor Husain, so far, that is, from the onset of the Delhi Sultanate to the end of Shahjahan's reign, i.e. from about 1200 A.D. to 1658 A.D., is styled by him "Hindustani Culture—I". Indian culture from about 1658 A.D. to about 1857 A.D. appears in his scheme as "Hindustani Culture—II".

Before proceeding further with Professor Husain's characterization of his "Hindustani Culture—II", I must draw the reader's attention to the fact that his "Hindustani Culture—I" is confined only to Northern India, and to be specific, it leaves completely the whole of the South and almost completely Eastern India except for the mention of Bhuvaneshwar. It also leaves out Maharashtra except for the mention of Namdev and Tukaram in a casual context of Bhakti and of Shivaji still more casually, and it leaves out Gujarat wholly. Vijayanagar and its glories are so thoroughly ignored that one cannot help feeling that they are an anathema to most Muslim writers.

In his brochure in the Aligarh Muslim University General Education scheme entitled *Indian Culture*, Professor Abid Husain has abandoned his divisions of "Hindustani Culture". It is conceived as a whole and is given the specific period 1526-1773 A.D. Hindustani culture thus is identified with Moghul culture. In extending the period to 1773 A.D. in pursuit of the end of the Moghul rule, Professor Husain has done violence to both political

\* See my *Rajput Architecture*, 1968

<sup>10</sup> Husain, *The National Culture of India*, pp. 107-8. Italics mine.

and cultural history of India. After 1740 Moghul Raj was so only in name and after 1757 new forces had already established themselves. As for culture, with the rise of the Peshwas about 1720 A.D. Indian culture could no longer be identified with the Muslim culture of Northern India. Actually, however, Professor Husain has carried forward his Hindustani Culture period to the year 1857!

Professor Husain, in his *The National Culture of India* (pp. 112-3), though not stating the period in terms of chronological counting, starts his characterization of Second Hindustani Culture with the decline of the Moghul Empire about the end of Aurangzeb's reign and asserts that though Hindustani Culture "reflected the degeneration" yet "it continued to occupy the position of common culture of India and even increased its sphere of influence". The increase in the sphere of influence is attested by its operating from "new centres like Lucknow, Hyderabad and Murshidabad". He asserts that it "served as the common culture of large sections of people throughout the country till the cataclysm [?] of 1857 dealt the death-blow from which it never recovered"!

He admits that "from the point of view of literary and scientific progress" the period was disappointing, the quality of books produced being "much lower" than that in the first period of Hindustani culture. After mentioning seven or eight Muslim writers who all appear to have used the Persian language, Professor Husain can only say for his so-called Hindustani Culture, which to be entitled to that name must show a significant component to have been the contribution of Hindus as they formed not less than eighty per cent of the population :

The contribution of Hindus is in many fields as important as that of Muslims. The numerous translations from Sanskrit into Persian were done exclusively by Hindus.<sup>41</sup>

Adding the view that no great architecture was produced in the period, Professor Husain<sup>42</sup> asserts that "the modest palaces, tombs, places of worship which were built show the general characteristics of the Moghul or Hindustani style". The two palaces and the three so-called tombs instanced by him are all Hindu or Sikh. He mentions only two religious buildings, one is the Vishveshwar [Vishveshvar] Maudir in Benares and the other is the Amritsar Golden Temple of the Sikhs. In instancing the Vishveshwar temple he has evidently followed Dr Tara Chand blindfold.

In the post-1773 period whatever cultural components are described are all the British endeavour to stabilize their rule. I have left out the language component of culture as the topic is touched upon in the chapter on linguistic tensions.

<sup>41</sup> *The National Culture of India*, p. 114

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 116.

In his Aligarh brochure, *Indian Culture* (p. 22) Professor Husain, under the alternative caption "The Period of Political and Cultural Disintegration" for the section of history that began with the passing of Harshvardhana of Kanauj, more explicitly states the above view of Indian history and culture for the benefit of the Muslim intelligentsia that draws its intellectual food from Aligarh and forms the leaven of leadership of Muslim Indians.

The Pakistani ex-professor politician I. Qureshi has gone much further in propounding the view of hiatus or barrenness of North Indian, and of course of Rajasthani, culture at about the time of the advent of the Muslims in India. He says:<sup>43</sup>

The Muslim conquerors could not have been interested in the demolition of palaces and other secular buildings . . . they should have found mention in the writings of chroniclers and travellers; the archaeologist's spade would have brought them to light. . . The truth seems to be that the *Rajput kingdoms were poor in their architectural achievements* . . . a few miles from Udaipur there are temples which never have been desecrated by any Muslim conqueror; the examples can be multiplied, but there is no Madura or Srirangam among them. What is true of architecture is true of other fields of artistic and religious activity. This was a period of little achievement and progress; *stagnation was the hallmark of Hindu society in North India at the time of the Muslim conquest.*

As a preliminary to my criticism of these views I shall state

1. that the so-called Hindustani Culture of these writers is not merely North Indian Culture of Moghul period but that, too, very predominantly only of the Muslims.
2. that if both the North Indian Hindu component, and more so the psychology of the Hindu population, and the great component of the whole of the South, under the aegis of the Yadavas, the Hoysalas, the Pandvas, the Vijayanagar monarchs, the Navaks and the Peshwas are considered, the so-called Hindustani Culture will be a complete whole as Indian Culture whose components, Hindu and Muslim, stand out more or less distinct and separate;
3. that in the domain of architecture, where the strongest claim of synthesis is made, the Hindu style, while providing significant elements to the formation of the aesthetic style of Muslim architecture in India, in its religious variety remained aloof from the Muslim style without incorporating its main points;
4. that wherever the Hindus attempted to follow the Muslim style they either floundered or created structures which demonstrate its

<sup>43</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 105 Italics mine.



blasting effect on the Hindu ideas of religious atmosphere and of aesthetic values; and

5. that at least two of the Hindu arts, those of sculpture and dance, suffered from the Muslim rule in India, the former a total eclipse and the latter both loss of prestige and stagnation through that loss and want of elite patronage.

Far from there having been a hiatus or stagnation in North Indian, particularly Rajasthani, culture including architecture and other arts at about the time of the invasion and conquest of India by Muslims the period from about 800 A.D. to 1200 A.D. is characterized by high culmination of both sacred architecture and sculpture, music, dance and civil architecture recording similar culmination in Rajasthan in the 14th and 15th centuries. The Sas-Bahu and the Telika Mandir temples of Gwalior, the Kanadriya Mahadev and other great temples of Khajuraho, the world-renowned Jaina temples of Mt. Abu, Udayesvara and other temples of Dhar-Malwa region, Baroli-Chandravati-Menal-area temples within Chitod's aura, and the temples of Osian-Kiradu and other centres in Jodhpur region—from where Dr Tara Chand draws his illustration of the Ranpur Jaina temple of two to three centuries later—and the great Shejapur, Modhera and other temples of Northern Gujarat bear an eloquent testimony to the sustained and enormous temple-building activity of the highest aesthetic and technical quality by the Rajputs for over four centuries,\* till they were shocked into lull through an utter depletion of the warrior section for about two centuries. And what is even more significant is that their architects and craftsmen carried forward in a much more developed form the cultural stream which was opened up by the intelligentsia of the Imperial Guptas five centuries before the Rajputs began to be active.

Dr Tara Chand thinks that the two centuries from about 1230 A.D. to 1530 A.D. mark a void in Hindu architectural activity. Maintaining that there had taken place a fusion of Hindu and Muslim styles of architecture early, he asserts categorically not only that the Muslim impact had transformed the ancient Hindu aesthetic values but also that the Hindus adopted and implemented the "Hindu-Muslim style" of architecture for their temples. Beginning with the Ranpur temple, about which his contention is shown above to be only partially true and his implication wholly incorrect, Dr Tara Chand instances the Govinda Deva temple at Brindavan built by Raja Man Singh in 1590 A.D., the ruined Madan Mohan temple of the same era and the Jugal Kishor temple built in 1627 A.D., the Jain temples at Sonagadh in Bundelkhand and the one at Muktagiri in Berar. He further instances (1) the Gopinath temple built by one Raisil, an officer of Akbar;

\* The contribution of Rajputs to the Indian architecture of a millennium, 700 A.D. to 1700 A.D., is so great that I have devoted a whole book to it and named it *Rajput Architecture*, 1968.

(2) The Harideva temple at Govardhan built by Raja Bhagwan Das; (3) the Visvesvara temple at Varanasi (Benares) and "the temple built by Sindhia's mother at Gwalior". And about the Jain temple built by Sheth Hathi Singh at Ahmedabad, he<sup>44</sup> observes:

Even the Jain temple of Hathi Singh at Ahmedabad which may appear to be an exception is not really one; its unsculptured spires, unornamented walls, and smooth-faced domes are enough testimony to the failure of the attempt, if any was made, to revive an ancient taste, and to the compelling force of the new art values and aesthetic feelings.

Professor Kabir,<sup>45</sup> in his historical section, has emphasized an apparent feature of Indian history which has not received proper attention from historians. He is sure that from the days of Asoka to those of Harshavardhana in the 7th century, it was from the east that political leadership came, and that from the 8th century, "the centre of power shifts from the east and hovers round the central point of Delhi for about a thousand years". And he explains this supposed "fact" and the "Rajput glory and rise to power" during the period to "the shifting commercial orientation of India". Till the 8th century, he contends, the Indian trade routes were oriented towards the east to "the Indian colonies and overseas settlements" and that after the rise of Muslim Arabs the maritime trade of India flowed westwards, making Gujarat with Saurashtra an important focus of such wealth-bringing trade and commerce. Rajputana which "lies directly on the trade route from Delhi to Gujarat thus came into the picture as the connecting or disconnecting unit. He finds that soon there arises a struggle between Rajput chieftains for supremacy over this region. When he immediately after affirms that "soon the struggle gives place to the conflict between Mewar and Delhi" he evidently asserts that the Delhi Muslim power nearly crushed the Rajputs completely by 1300 A.D. and entered on an incessant warfare with the Rajput house of Mewar, the most recalcitrant, and, in terms of Professor Kabir's causation theory, most eager to keep the key to the western commerce, in order to acquire the same for itself. Professor Kabir, who is keen on having Indian history of the Muslim period purged of its jarring facts, which are extremely inconvenient for the thesis of a working—or is it harmonious and beautiful?—fusion and synthesis of Hindu-Muslim cultures asserts:

From the time of Alauddin right down to the days of Akbar, the course of Indian history centres round this struggle. *The battle cry used in this struggle was often religious or communal, but the core of the conflict undoubtedly lay in the desire to control this important trade and*

<sup>44</sup> *Op cit.*, p. 256.

<sup>45</sup> *Op cit.*, pp 90-2.

*thus dominate the economic life of the country.\**

Professor Kabir, to uphold his theory of the economic causation of the struggle, first between the Rajputs themselves and later between the Rajput house of Mewad and the Delhi Muslim power, brings in the so-called "sudden fading of Rajput power out of the picture" as a significant point and attributes it to "a new shift in the centres of Indian trade and commerce". With the Europeans rounding the Cape of Good Hope and establishing trading establishment on the south-western and the south-eastern coasts of India, he assures his readers, the importance of Gujarat declined. This decline brought about the death of the Rajput significance—and their spirit too!—and lifted up the Marathas! As he states, immediately after alluding to the rise of the Maratha power, that the establishment of the European trading centres on the West coast "made the control of the Indian Ocean one of the most important factors in the economic life of India" he must be presumed to imply the genesis of the rise of Shivaji to this urge. However, history tells a different story, that Shivaji's father, a brave and competent commander of efficient troops, served the Muslim states of the Deccan and Shivaji since his boyhood was impelled by a hatred of the Muslims and a keen desire to free his land of them restoring its religion to its own former position. Shivaji came to recognize the importance of the sea only late in his career when in the expansion of his field of action he came up with the British at Surat and "Siddhi", the Abyssinian chief of Jaujira nearer home.

The fact is that like his exonerating palliative of the historically attested fact of the Muslim generals and monarchs despoiling and demolishing the Hindu temples, both for their treasures, for their idolatory, and also for the pillars and other finely worked stones to be used to glorify themselves and "their" God, noted in an earlier chapter, this statement of Professor Kabir is based on wrong assumptions, treating them as if they were historical facts. Both his assumption of the eastern location and orientation of commerce and trade routes, and his contention about the parties locked in struggle and warfare as well as their aims in these struggles are incorrect.

At least since about the 1st century before Christ, the great trade-routes of external commerce of Northern India converged on Kalyan near Bombay. Schoff's<sup>46</sup> valuable comments on the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* should have enlightened Professor Kabir on this. And Dr Radha Kumud Mookerji's<sup>47</sup> *Indian Shipping* should have apprised him further of the general belief among competent scholars that Java received colonies of Sarashtrian people from Gujarat in the 5th to the 7th century. Cambay and

\* Italics mine.

<sup>46</sup> Pp. 179, 188, 193, 196-7, 245; also Fergusson, *op cit.*, II, p. 358.

<sup>47</sup> Pp 105, 108-09; Cf. M. R Majumdar, p 71 and Pls. XI and XII; Also Cf. D Diringer, *The Alphabet*, 1946, p. 423.

Broach have been reported by travellers to have been great ports carrying on foreign sea-borne trade from about the 1st century of the Christian era to the beginning of the 17th century when Surat began to compete with them.<sup>48</sup>

Confirmation of the seafaring and culture-carrying activities of the people of the Western coast, particularly of the people of Gujarat and Saurashtra is provided by palaeography of Malaya and Indo-China. The forms of some of the letters of some inscriptions of the area dated before the 8th century A.D. have been traced back to their Gujarat prototypes by Dr Ahmad H. Dani. And though Dr D. C. Sircar, perhaps out of his parochial patriotism, has tried to controvert the palaeographic evidence by argumentation, the actual data furnished by him support only the conclusion drawn by Dr Dani.<sup>49</sup>

The Ajanta frescoes of the 6th to the 8th century provide the additional information that the Chalukya monarch Pulakesin received at his court Persians and that the Deccan about that time was either a shipping centre or was interested in many-sailed and therefore ocean-going ships!

Actually the state of affairs made Surat the most important port on the west coast in the fourth decade of the 17th century, i.e., just about the time the Rajputs were all exhausted, except for almost the last flicker which made them stand a long-drawn struggle with Aurangzeb and succeed after his death. M. R. Majumdar observes:

The silting of the head of the Gulf of Cambay, the disturbed state of North Gujarat, and the destruction of Diu by the Muskati Arabs in 1670 combined to make of Surat a trade centre for the whole of Gujarat, and its importance as the "Gateway of Mecca" was further enhanced by the strong religious feeling fostered by the Emperor [Aurangzeb] in the Indian Muslims.<sup>50</sup>

Professor Humayun Kabir's thesis that the period of Rajput importance in Indian history was conditioned by economic matters, particularly the flow of trade and commerce with the outside world, is thus found to be unsupported by the facts of sober history.

The postulation of a three-century disorganization, cultural dislocation or hiatus ending with the beginning of the 11th century by Professor Abid Husain and Professor Kabir's silence over it, combined with his facile economic explanation of the significance and eclipse of the Rajputs, both provide a sort of a *raison d'être* for Muslim inroad, and a valid ground for Muslim rule making it an opportune God-send for India and her culture.

<sup>48</sup> M. R. Majumdar, *Cultural History of Gujarat*, 1965, pp. 61-5, 68-70, 85.

<sup>49</sup> Ahmad H. Dani, *Indian Palaeography*, 1963, pp. 229-33, 239-40, 245; D. C. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, 1965, pp. 202-01

<sup>50</sup> M. R. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 70

The implication evidently is that Indian culture would have gone into the doldrums, but for the timely and almost divinely ordained intervention of the Muslim rule. Such a postulation facilitates an exoneration of Muslim monarchs from the charge of having demolished Hindu temples and destroyed other works of art, especially with the help of the imaginary destructive role of the Huns and Gurjaras who preceded the Muslims by five to six centuries. In the hands of the Pakistani politician-intellectual, I. Qureshi, it takes the open form and a plain statement which is briefly quoted above.

Enough evidence has been already stated here in a nutshell to show that there is no hiatus as postulated by Professor Husain. The Rajputs continued the development of Indian culture as they inherited it in the 6th or the 7th century. They did it with such intensity that the style of architecture, particularly temple architecture of Northern India west of Allahabad between the 8th and the end of the 12th century, ought to be justly designated the Rajput style of architecture, as I have done in a recent book of mine.\*

As for the denial of the destructive role of the Muslim rule in India, it, too, is clearly untenable, as from Colonel Tod through General Cunningham, Fergusson and Burgess to Percy Brown, all writers on art and archaeology of India have amply testified to the great, wanton and callous destruction of temples indulged in by many Muslim rulers in India.

As for Professor Kabir's Huns and Gurjars destroying temples and thus denuding North India of her older monuments so as to enable Kabir to exonerate the Muslim rulers from the charge of destruction of these, I shall draw my reader's attention to the irony presented by the Rajput tradition immortalized by Colonel Tod<sup>1</sup> which asserts that the beautiful temples whose ruins lie at Baroli, were built by a Hun Raja who held his court at Menal or Mahawal and that a particular hall was the wedding pandal in which he married a Rajput princess.

In addition to the remarks about ruins of temples having been due to the activity of zealous Muslim rulers made by Tod and quoted or mentioned here and there already, I must present a few more observations and nuances which in a concerted manner can state Tod's view about it.

Tod on visiting Ajmir says:<sup>2</sup>

Ajmir has been too long the haunt of Moghuls and Pathans, the Goths and Vandals of Rajasthan, to afford much scope to the researches of the antiquary. Whatever time had spared of the hallowed relics of old, bigotry has destroyed or raised to herself, altars of materials, whose sculptured fragments served now as disjointed memorials of two distinct

\* See my *Rajput Architecture*, 1968.

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, III, pp. 1064, 1758, 1762-3, 1785, 1788; Fergusson, II, pp. 134-5.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 896, 898-9.

Broach have been reported by travellers to have been great ports carrying on foreign sea-borne trade from about the 1st century of the Christian era to the beginning of the 17th century when Surat began to compete with them.<sup>48</sup>

Confirmation of the seafaring and culture-carrying activities of the people of the Western coast, particularly of the people of Gujarat and Saurashtra is provided by palaeography of Malaya and Indo-China. The forms of some of the letters of some inscriptions of the area dated before the 8th century A.D. have been traced back to their Gujarat prototypes by Dr Ahmad H. Dani. And though Dr D. C. Sircar, perhaps out of his parochial patriotism, has tried to controvert the palaeographic evidence by argumentation, the actual data furnished by him support only the conclusion drawn by Dr Dani.<sup>49</sup>

The Ajanta frescoes of the 6th to the 8th century provide the additional information that the Chalukya monarch Pulakesin received at his court Persians and that the Deccan about that time was either a shipping centre or was interested in many-sailed and therefore ocean going ships!

Actually the state of affairs made Surat the most important port on the west coast in the fourth decade of the 17th century, i.e., just about the time the Rajputs were all exhausted, except for almost the last flicker which made them stand a long-drawn struggle with Aurangzeb and succeed after his death, M. R. Majumdar observes:

The silting of the head of the Gulf of Cambay, the disturbed state of North Gujarat, and the destruction of Diu by the Muskati Arabs in 1670 combined to make of Surat a trade centre for the whole of Gujarat, and its importance as the "Gateway of Mecca" was further enhanced by the strong religious feeling fostered by the Emperor [Aurangzeb] in the Indian Muslims.<sup>50</sup>

Professor Humayun Kabir's thesis that the period of Rajput importance in Indian history was conditioned by economic matters, particularly the flow of trade and commerce with the outside world, is thus found to be unsupported by the facts of sober history.

The postulation of a three-century disorganization, cultural dislocation or hiatus ending with the beginning of the 11th century by Professor Abid Husain and Professor Kabir's silence over it, combined with his facile economic explanation of the significance and eclipse of the Rajputs, both provide a sort of a *raison d'être* for Muslim inroad, and a valid ground for Muslim rule making it an opportune God-send for India and her culture.

The implication evidently is that Indian culture would have gone into the doldrums, but for the timely and almost divinely ordained intervention of the Muslim rule. Such a postulation facilitates an exoneration of Muslim monarchs from the charge of having demolished Hindu temples and destroyed other works of art, especially with the help of the imaginary destructive role of the Huns and Gurjaras who preceded the muslims by five to six centuries. In the hands of the Pakistani politician-intellectual, I. Qureshi, it takes the open form and a plain statement which is briefly quoted above.

Enough evidence has been already stated here in a nutshell to show that there is no hiatus as postulated by Professor Husain. The Rajputs continued the development of Indian culture as they inherited it in the 6th or the 7th century. They did it with such intensity that the style of architecture, particularly temple architecture of Northern India west of Allahabad between the 8th and the end of the 12th century, ought to be justly designated the Rajput style of architecture, as I have done in a recent book of mine.\*

As for the denial of the destructive role of the Muslim rule in India, it, too, is clearly untenable, as from Colonel Tod through General Cunningham, Fergusson and Burgess to Percy Brown, all writers on art and archaeology of India have amply testified to the great, wanton and callous destruction of temples indulged in by many Muslim rulers in India.

As for Professor Kabi's Huns and Gurjars destroying temples and thus denuding North India of her older monuments so as to enable Kabir to exonerate the Muslim rulers from the charge of destruction of these, I shall draw my reader's attention to the irony presented by the Rajput tradition immortalized by Colonel Tod<sup>3</sup> which asserts that the beautiful temples whose ruins lie at Baroli, were built by a Hun Raja who held his court at Menal or Mahanad and that a particular hall was the wedding pandal in which he married a Rajput princess.

In addition to the remarks about ruins of temples having been due to the activity of zealous Muslim rulers made by Tod and quoted or mentioned here and there already, I must present a few more observations and musings which in a concerted manner can state Tod's view about it.

Tod on visiting Ajmir says: <sup>2</sup>

Ajmir has been too long the haunt of Moghuls and Pathans, the Goths and Vandals of Rajasthan, to afford much scope to the researches of the antiquary. Whatever time had spared of the hallowed relics of old, bigotry has destroyed or raised to herself, altars of materials, whose sculptured fragments served now as disjointed memorials of two distinct

and distant eras: that of the independent Hindu, and that of the conquering Muhammadan, whose idgahs and mosques, mausoleums and country seats, constructed from the wrecks of aboriginal art, are fast mouldering to decay. The associations they call forth afford the only motive to wish their preservation . . .

Tod couched his musings in fourteen lines of verse of which the first two and the last two may be quoted here. They are:

I ask'd of *Time* for whom *those* temples rose,  
That prostrate by his hand in silence lie;  
Whose these vast domes that ev'n in ruin shine?  
*I reckon not whose*, he said: *they now are mine.*

Next comes the prince of Indian antiquarians General Cunningham only some years after Tod. Pondering over the Hindu temples of Khajuraho and Mahoba, on having come across a few of them intact after seven, eight, or nine or even ten centuries, the sedate and judicious inquirer<sup>53</sup> observes:

As Mahoba was for some time the headquarters of the early Muhammadan Governors, we could hardly expect to find that any Hindu buildings had escaped their furious bigotry, or their equally destructive cupidity. . . It must be admitted, however, that in none of the cities which the early Muhammadans occupied permanently, *have they left a single temple standing, save this solitary temple at Mahoba, which doubtless owed its preservation solely to its secure position amid the deep waters of the "Madan-Sagar"*. In Delhi and Mathura, in Benaras and Jonpur, in Narwar and Ajmer, every single temple was destroyed by their bigotry; but thanks to their cupidity, most of the beautiful Hindu pillars were preserved, and many of them, perhaps, on their original positions, to form new colonnades for the masjids and tombs of the conquerors. . . . In the Dargah of Pir Mubarak Shah, and the adjacent Musalman burial-ground, I counted 310 Hindu pillars of granite.

Not more than 20 years after Cunningham wrote the above-quoted lines, Growse<sup>54</sup> wrote about Bulandshahr District of U.P.:

As might have been expected from its nearness to Delhi, the Muhammadans have made a clean sweep of the district, and razed to the ground every building, secular or religious, that had been erected by

<sup>53</sup> *Arch. Survey Reports*, II, p. 440.

<sup>54</sup> Quoted in Vincent A. Smith and K. De B. Codrington, *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, p. 126, f.n. 2.



its former Hindu rulers.

The hypothesis of Hindu-Muslim architectural fusion propounded by Dr Tara Chand and Professor Humayun Kabir may now be scrutinized. First of all, it must be stated that Dr Tara Chand, under the charm of Islamic influence, appears to have ignored or forgotten a whole chapter in Indian history and culture, when he asserted that the three centuries from 1230 A.D. to 1530 A.D. marked a void in Hindu architectural activity. Rana Mokal and his son Rana Kumbha, making all allowance for likely exaggeration of tradition, have to be accorded a very high place among the brave, self-respecting, and extraordinarily able sons of India. The work of aesthetic regeneration started by them has left an abiding influence and undying monuments.\* I have had occasion to mention at least two temples built by Kumbha, whose Tower of Fame at Chitod, on the background of the fate of its initiation put up at Mandu by an Islamic monarch of Malwa soon after Kumbha's tower was built, testifies to the correctness of the view propounded here and flatly disproves Dr Tara Chand's assertion.

About the temple Rana Kumbha built at Chitod Fergusson<sup>55</sup> observes: ". . . taking it all in all, it certainly is more like an ancient temple than any other of its age I am acquainted with. It was a revival, the last expiring effort of a style that was dying out, in that form at least." The last portion of Fergusson's comment is only partially correct. He himself slightly modifies it when he remarks about the cenotaphs of the Ranas of Udaypur, where the Ranas of Chitod moved their capital after Akbar's sack of Chitod in 1568 A.D. thus: "These last two illustrations . . . are practically in the Jaina style of architecture; for, though adopting a Muhammadan form, the Ranas of Udaypur clung to the style of architecture which their ancestors had practised, and which under Kumbha Rana had only recently become so famous."

This flatly and very correctly contradicts the favourite thesis of Dr Tara Chand<sup>56</sup> that the Hindus, after they had arrived at, or were brought to, a sort of an equilibrium within the Indian world of Islamic rule, did not return to their own pre-Islamic style of architecture but adopted the new "fused" Hindu-Muslim one even for their sacred architecture.

Both in temple architecture and in civil domestic or monumental architecture till the end of the 15th century the Hindus of Northern India, or rather of Rajput-India, were marching on the path laid down by their tradition and modified by the experts of their time, who were writing on the subject, and by their kings of exceptional calibre in aesthetic lines of arts. There was hardly any direct influence of Muslim practice to be traced in their productions, the tall temple "sikhara"—with perhaps reduced orna-

mentation than that characterizing the middle-period-temples—marking a slight departure from the old norms. Almost three centuries of Muslim rule and Islamic architectural practice had proved incapable of affecting the original ideas of the Hindus on art and architecture. Nor did the iconoclastic zeal and the contemptuous attitude to so-called idolatory indulged in by the Muslim conquerors induce the Hindus to stop building temples and preparing idols for worship.

In post-Moghul times it is contended by Dr Tara Chand,<sup>57</sup> Professor Humayun Kabir and some others that even the temples of the Hindus reflected Indo-Muslim architectural influence in more ways than one: domes and arches, and plain exterior and even interior, being the specific items of such influence. To examine the validity of this contention I shall begin by studying some of the important examples Dr Tara Chand has quoted in favour of his thesis, keeping as far as possible, to the chronological sequence.

Akbar genuinely attempted an amalgam of the Hindu and the Muslim—in civil architecture more of Hindu than of Muslim,—and succeeded in putting up a number of beautiful and impressive structures. By his marriage with a Rajput princess of one lineage he had ingratiated some of the famous Rajput houses. One of the Rajput relatives by marriage, Raja Man Singh, built the temple at Brindavan known as Govind Deva temple, of which Dr Tara Chand has made so much as evidence of Hindu-Muslim architectural fusion and Hindu acceptance of Muslim elements in their religious architecture.

Dr Tara Chand and others who depend upon this temple for their theory of Hindu-Muslim architectural fusion have ignored that in the matter of its storeyed exterior and even of general plan and elevation, except for the twin-sanctuary, which being utterly in ruins remains an enigma—it had a predecessor at the not very distant place of Gwalior, antedating it by five centuries or more, the larger Sas-Bahu temple. Any one reading the appraisal of the whole group by F. S. Growse, who more than any one else brought these temples to the notice of the students of Indian architecture, written half a century before Dr Tara Chand published his views, would not write in the enthusiastic manner about them as Dr Tara Chand did.

F. S. Growse<sup>58</sup> has an interesting observation bearing on the relationship between the Sas-Bahu temple of Gwalior and the Brindavan temple of Man Singh. He says:

The magnificent effect which they [the open arcades crowning the facade] would have had may be gathered from a view of the Jain temple [at p. 255 Growse admits his error and tells his readers that they are

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 242-43, 249-50, 256

<sup>58</sup> *Mathura, a District Memoir*, 1880, p. 230.

Hindu temples/ in the Gwalior fort; which, though some 600 years earlier in date, is in general arrangement the nearest parallel to the Brindaban fame and would seem to have supplied Man Singh with a model.

The following passage from Growse's work quite conclusively supports the thesis put forward here as it emerges from a careful study of the history of the architectural endeavour of the Rajputs from about 800 to about 1500 A.D. Says Growse:<sup>59</sup>

From about the year 1200 A.D. the architectural history of Mathura is an absolute blank till the middle of the 16th century, when, under the beneficent sway of the Emperor Akbar, the eclectic style, style so characteristic of his own religious views, produced the magnificent series of temples, which even in their ruin are still to be admired at Brindaban. The temple of Radha Ballabh, built in the next reign, that of Jahangir, is the last example of the style. *Its characteristic note can scarcely be defined as the fusion, but rather as the parallel exhibition of the Hindu and Muhammadan method.* Thus in a facade one storcy, or one compartment, shows a succession of multifoil Sarascenic arches, while above and below, or on either side, every opening is square-headed with the architrave supported on projecting brackets. The one is purely Muhammadan, the other is as distinctly Hindu. . .

About the true radiating arches of the vault of the "mandapa" what Fergusson<sup>60</sup> has stated has much significance for us. He is positive that it is "the only instance, except one, known to exist in a Hindu temple in the north of India". Unfortunately Fergusson has not mentioned the other temple. I have been unable to trace it, which has a similarly vaulted dome, as I take it, only on the "mandapa". And once again as in plan, according to Growse,<sup>61</sup> Fergusson is not quite accurate. Growse has pointed out that the arches are more ornaments than structural elements.

Even Man Singh ventured not to put up a dome over the sanctum. Nay, Growse's<sup>62</sup> postulation of five spires for Man Singh's Govinda Deva temple at Brindavan, would establish Man Singh's desire to conceal the one dome, which he had raised on true radiating arches, to be concealed from public view!

In support of my suggestion that, apart from the fact of the Govinda Deva Temple being rather an exception than a rule for post-Moghul Hindu temples it was a special case of an eclectic Emperor's able and shrewd

<sup>59</sup> Growse, *op. cit.*; pp. 160-1. Italics mine. A fine, the finest available in books, reproduction is given *opp.* p. 224.

<sup>60</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 156.

<sup>61</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 223, 229.

<sup>62</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 223-4; Fergusson, II, p. 156, f.n.

favourite and admirer pandering to his hero's taste and mission—I may mention that Percy Brown<sup>63</sup> points out “the almost entire absence of figure carving” in this temple. Though figure-sculpture on temples had been getting progressively less and less in North Indian temples since about the 12th century A.D., it had not disappeared in other and even later specimens as completely as in this temple built by Man Singh. And what was the total achievement in this piece of fused architecture? Let Percy Brown speak through his following observation:

... while the Govinda Deva temple is an architectural composition of no little formal beauty, consisting as it does of a combination of balconies and loggias, of bracketed archways and moulded buttresses, wide eaves and ornamental parapets, all carefully disposed so as to be in perfect accord with one another, there is at the same time an almost complete absence of that quality of humanism, together with a deficiency in that supreme spiritual content which one has learned to expect incorporated in the design of all Hindu of the more orthodox type.<sup>64</sup>

No wonder therefore that we do not find this de-humanized model adhered to in the later specimens of Rajput Hindu sacred or semi-sacred architecture!

To clinch the issue against Dr Tara Chand, Professor Humayun Kabir and others of their way of thinking in this matter, I should point out that even the Rajput lineage of Ajmir-Jaipur, which entered into marital relations with the Imperial Moghul house, did not set aside the purely Hindu architectural form as developed through time for a semi-religious purpose. Raja Bhagawandas, the father-in-law of Akbar and the uncle [?] of Raja Man Singh, in putting up a memorial structure for his mother at Mathura in 1570 A.D., evidently took Kumbha's Tower of Fame for his standard. The monument known as Sati Burj,<sup>65</sup> which is 55 feet high and has four storeys, is reminiscent of the Tower of Fame rather than of any Muslim monument. It was topped by a “sikhara” approximating the mitre-shaped “sikharas” of some Jain temples at Khajuraho and at Sonagadh figured in Sir Lepel Griffin's book *Famous Monuments of Central India*.

The hypothesis of fusion sponsored by Dr Tara Chand and Professor Humayun Kabir appealed to them partly because of their wrong notions criticized so far and also because they saw Bengal through the eyes of Bengali Muslims, who have retained their native Bengali as the mother tongue. Particularly is this the case with Kabir who is known to be a good poet in Bengali. Bengali religious poetry provided Professor Humayun Kabir with his link in the chain of his thoughts establishing a fusion of

<sup>63</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, p. 154.

<sup>64</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, p. 154.

<sup>65</sup> S. S. Growse: *Mathura, a District Memoir*, 1880, p. 138 and illustration opposite.

Hindu Muslim religious culture, or at least a distinct modification in the Hindu religious views of the pre-Muslim period, and Bengali temple architecture prompted Dr Tara Chand<sup>66</sup> to wax eloquent on the actual adoption of Islamic architectural elements in their sacred architecture by the Hindus. And he built his convenient theory on the basis of the temple at Kantanagar in Dinajpur District of Bengal, now Bengal of Pakistan, pictured by Fergusson<sup>67</sup> many years earlier in his book on Indian architecture. The temple was completed in 1722 A.D. Fergusson further noted two more temples of the same style, one at Gopalganj in Dinajpur, built about 40 years later, and another "known as the Black Pagoda" at Calcutta of unknown date, remarking that there were "many others through Lower Bengal" like them.

Of the quality of these Bengali temples of the 18th century Fergusson's estimate was that the carvings on the Kantanagar temple are "immeasurably" inferior to those on the old temples of Orissa or Mysore.

Vincent Smith and K. De B. Codrington<sup>68</sup> referring to the Kantanagar temple asserted that the style was peculiar to Bengal, the only example outside Bengal being the temple at Bilhari, in the Central Provinces, which was built for a Bengali resident of the region. They characterized the style as "the late medieval Bengal variety" of the *Aryavarta*, Indo-Aryan in Fergusson's categories style. Describing its characteristics as a bent cornice "obviously copied from the bamboo eaves of an ordinary Bengal hut" and "a peculiar arrangement of curvilinear steeples", they saw in it "signs of Muhammadan influence". This view evidently gave Dr Tara Chand the clue.

Percy Brown<sup>69</sup> only about 12 years later, drawing upon S. K. Saraswati's paper *The Begunia Group of Temples* and on J. C. French's book *Art of the Pal Empire of Bengal*, has attempted to give a connected view of the development of temple architecture in Bengal. He has not drawn upon the Kantanagar temple for illustration and comment but has mentioned the five-towered or five-steepled temple of Syamraya,<sup>70</sup> one of a group of temples at Vishnupur in Bankura District which, he says, were put up by the Vaishnavite rajas of Manbhum "from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries".\*

Brown sees the effect of the Islamization of Bengal, which he thinks

<sup>66</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 249-50, 254-56.

<sup>67</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 159-61.

<sup>68</sup> *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, (1930), pp. 117-8.

<sup>69</sup> *Op. cit.*, *Buddhist, Hindu Period*, pp. 185-8.

<sup>70</sup> For a good reproduction of this temple see J.A.S.B. (N.S.) Vol. V (1909), p. 150 (4 and 5).

\* Brown writes as if the reference is to his Pl. CXVII, though that plate gives a reproduction of the Kistaraya, *forbangla*, Krishnaraya double-house, at Vishnupur, which shows only one spire or tower, the central one, and that too with a curvilinear corniced top.

began to make itself felt from the 13th century, in the "tendency towards a more primitive form of structural expression which distinguishes the building art of Bengal subsequent to the medieval period".

A full description of the type of temple as it existed in pre-Muslim Bengal can only be dubiously reconstructed. Without attempting such a task here it may be stated that Islamic architecture has provided Bengal with an example to follow and has thus influenced its sacred architecture. We are provided with an illustration by A. V. T. Iyer<sup>71</sup> of the "navaratna", nine-jewelled temple of Rammath at Calcutta, which has a two-storeyed "mandapa" attached to it, raised on five-pointed arches making up the front facets. Thus has the Bengal sacred architecture experimented lining up with the Hindu temple architecture of other parts, with the acceptance of some Islamic elements.

It may now be pointed out that temples with domes, even ribbed ones, on the sanctum, which are most often always one-celled are met with in Bombay city, and are recorded by me<sup>72</sup> in large numbers in the heart of Maharashtra and are to be met with in taluka-towns or large villages. They represent the poverty of the people and not so much their willingness to imitate Muslim architectural practice.

Fergusson wrote<sup>73</sup> about the Hindu use of arch:

The Muhammedans taught them [the Hindus] to get over their prejudices and employ the arch in their civil buildings in their later time, but to the present day they avoid it in their temples in so far as it is possible to do so. In Orissa, however, in the 13th century, they built numerous bridges in various parts of the province, but never employed a true arch in any of them.

Dr Tara Chand's contention of Islamic influence on Hindu religious architecture is almost a myth and the small part of it, which approximates to truth and reality, revealing as it does, a sad story of poverty and loss of taste, cannot redound to the credit of Islamic rule and contact!

The theory of the fusion of Hindu-Muslim architecture into a unity to be designated as Indo-Muslim, or Hindustani or Hindu-Muslim according to one's choice or predilection, appears amusing even in the domain of civil architecture of palaces. For whereas from Man Singh's palace at Gwalior to that of Jagat Singh II built in the second quarter of the 18th century at Udaipur many, nay most, of the Hindu ones are standing proudly, hardly any of the Moghul or pre-Moghul Muslim ones is in a fit condition. One has to deduce this conclusion from the eloquent fact that neither Fergusson nor even Percy Brown, who has devoted a whole volume to Muslim

<sup>71</sup> A. V. T. Iyer, *Indian Architecture* (1930), Plate 30, p. 453.

<sup>72</sup> See *Anatomy of a Rururban Community*, 1963.

<sup>73</sup> *Op. cit.* II, p. 113.

period architecture has found it feasible, necessary or desirable to reproduce any of the Moghul or pre-Moghul structures of this nature, though many of these Islamic potentates are known to have put up palaces at more than one place in Northern India. The utmost that is done to illustrate the performance of Muslims in India in the domain of civil architecture is that Fergusson<sup>74</sup> has given us plans of three palaces, out of which one, that of Shahjahan at Delhi alone lies in India (Bharat). He has also given a reproduction of a hall in Akbar's palace at Allahabad.

Percy Brown's illustrations of civil architecture comprise the following palaces of Hindu monarchs and dwellings of others: (1) Man Singh's palace (pl. XCV, 1-2; XCVI, 1; XCVII, 1); (2) Amber (Jaipur) buildings in the Galtapass (pl. XCIV, 1); (3) palace at Udaipur (pl. XCIV, 2); (4) Jodhpur street scene (pl. XCVI, 2); (5) Amber (Jaipur) palace entrance of the 17th century (p. XCVIII, 1); (6) Lashkar, Gwalior, house of the 18th century (pl. XCVIII, 2); (7) Datia palace of C. 1620 (pl. XCIX, 1) and (8) Orchha palace begun by Raja Rudra Pratap who reigned 1501-31 A.D.

Competent students of the subject have, fortunately for us, made their considered observations on the relative merits and demerits and comparison of the functional relation of the palaces of Hindu and Muslim kings. They begin with General Cunningham's remarks about the differences between the palace of Man Singh at Gwalior where were most naturally evoked by the nearby palaces of two of the Moghul Emperors, Jehangir and Shahjahan.

Cunningham's opinion disposes of the supposed fusion of Hindu-Muslim culture in the matter of architecture in its functional relationship to pattern of living. Says Cunningham:<sup>75</sup>

From these observations it will be seen that the chief points of difference between the Hindu and Muhammadan buildings are not confined to the style but extend also to materials and mode of construction. . . . The Hindu roofs are mostly flat, being formed of stone beams and stone slabs without mortar, while the Muhammadan roofs are nearly all domes of the usual pointed form.

Fergusson<sup>76</sup> who thinks that what Akbar did, of course though "more than all that had been done before or since", was "to fuse the antagonistic feelings of the two religions [Hinduism and Islam] into at least a superficial similarity", speaks of his palace at Fatehpur Sikri as "a romance in stone" but does not bring out any specific point of fusion or "similarity". But in his description of his palace hall at Allahabad he makes it clear. The

<sup>74</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 298, 303, 310.

<sup>75</sup> *Arch. Sur. Rep.*, II, p. 352

<sup>76</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 168, 297

structure is a square with sixty-four columns "surrounded by a deep verandah of double columns with groups of four at angles, all surmounted by bracket capitals of the most elegant and richest design, and altogether as fine in style and as rich in ornament as anything in India".<sup>77</sup> The fusing endeavour and its resultant are further pointedly characterized by Fergusson in the distinction he draws between Akbar's work and that of Shahjahan. Fergusson observes: <sup>78</sup>

Nowhere is the contrast between the two styles more strongly marked than in the palace of Agra—from the red stone palace of Akbar or Jahangir, with *its rich sculptures and square Hindu construction*, a door opens into the white marble court of the harem of Shahjahan (1638-48), with all its feeble prettiness, but at the same time, marked with that peculiar elegance which is found only in the East.

With all this contrast, if one is led to the belief that there would have been complete unity in the architectural style and performance of Akbar and his great Rajput-Hindu contemporary admirers one would be grievously mistaken. For Fergusson himself has drawn a telling contrast between the palace at Amber begun by Akbar's favourite Raja Man Singh and completed by Raja Jaysingh I and that of Akbar at Fatehpur Sikri. Says Fergusson: <sup>79</sup>

There the Moslim antipathy to images confined the fancy of the decorator to purely inanimate objects, here the laxer creed of the Hindus enabled him *to indulge in elephant capitals and figure-sculpture of men and animals to any extent. The Hindus seem also to have indulged in colour and in mirrors to an extent that Akbar did not apparently feel himself justified in employing.* The consequence is that the whole has a richer and more picturesque effect than its Muhammadan rival, but the two together make up a curiously perfect illustration of *the architecture of that day, as seen from a Hindu, contrasted with that from a Muhammadan, point of view.*

Thus it is quite plain that the Hindus and the Muslims met, came quite close but did not coalesce into a unified whole, in their architectural achievement even in the civil domain and under the most propitious and promising of circumstances for harmonization and fusion in the reign of Akbar!

E. B. Havell's comparative appraisal of the Hindu palaces and their Muslim counterparts goes even further than Fergusson's encomium of

<sup>77</sup> Fergusson, II, p. 298.

<sup>78</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 308. Italics mine.

<sup>79</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 177 Italics mine.



Hindu palaces. Writing about the modern palaces and monasteries lining the banks of the Ganga, built not earlier than the 18th century A.D., he observes:<sup>80</sup>

To find anything to compare with them in Europe for largeness of design combined with perfection of craftsmanship one would have to go back to the early days of the Renaissance in Rome or Florence... *None of the Moghul palaces display such a stately front—only the fortress-palaces of the Rajputs compare with them in this respect.*"

Comparison and contrast in terms of architectural elements bring out the uniqueness of Rajput architecture thus in the words of Fergusson and Burgess:<sup>81</sup>

That the bracket is almost exclusively an original Indian form of capital can, I think, scarcely be doubted; but the system was carried much further by the Mughals, especially during the reign of Akbar, than it had ever been carried by its original inventors, *at least in the North. The Hindus, on receiving it back, luxuriated in its picturesque richness to an extent that astonishes every beholder; and half the effect of most of the modern buildings of India is owing to the bold projecting balcony and fanciful kiosks that diversify the otherwise plain walls.*

Whatever rapprochement was effected in the architectural field in the reign of Akbar proved ineffective to a large extent even to guide the Moghul emperors, the successors of Akbar, as the architectural activity of his grandson Shahjahan, the greatest of Moghul builders, testifies. The difference in the atmosphere and technique of the architectural performance of Shahjahan as observed by Fergusson was due to Shahjahan's predilection for and employment of foreign elements and craftsmen. Professor Abid Husain<sup>82</sup> observes:

during the reign of Shahjahan, which carried Moghul architecture to the height of perfection, new architects were brought from Persia and other countries and a fresh wave of foreign influences tended to weaken that of indigenous Hindu style.

The endeavour of Persianizing—the wave of Arabisizing was to arrive almost two and half centuries later—the Indian Muslim and Hindu India, which, on a proper scale, began rather so late in North India, is manifest among the Muslim kingdoms of the South from their inception, at least

<sup>80</sup> *Indian Architecture*, 1913, p. 229. Italics mine.

<sup>81</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 180-1. Italics mine.

<sup>82</sup> *The National Culture of India*, pp. 107-8.

from the 15th century, i.e., almost a century and a half before Shahjahan conceived of it for North India.

The great mosque of Gulbarga, built in 1367 A.D., about which Fergusson<sup>83</sup> opined that as against those of Delhi and Ajmir, which are "more interesting . . . from adventitious circumstances", it "owes its greatness only to its own original merits of design", was the work of an architect from Qazwan in northwest Persia.<sup>84</sup> About the Madrasa, the college founded by Mahmud Gawan at Bidar in 1472-81 A.D., Percy Brown<sup>85</sup> observes: ". . . there arose in Bidar a piece of Persia in India, a conception planted down in the Deccan capital *without any appreciable modifications being made to adapt it to its new environment . . . in short it might have been moved bodily from the Rijistan at Samarkhand.*" Generally, too, about the buildings of the five Bahamani kingdoms of the Deccan, Brown specifically affirms as having their sources in the architecture of Persia and of Delhi without any regional spontaneity. And it cannot be a mere accident that the architectural style of Bijapur, which had gained in material wealth immensely from its share of the Vijayanagar spoils, reached its zenith under Ibrahim II, 1580-1627 A.D., simultaneously with the golden age of the Safavis in Persia in the reign of Shah Abbas! The Bahamanis were thus foreign-oriented in their cultural, at least architectural, intake! How can we expect them to contribute to a synthesis or fusion of Hindu-Muslim architecture?

The children of the soil, the Hoysalas of Dvarasamudra and the Vijayanagar dynasties of Hampi, over almost an equal stretch of time, produced without any foreign help or even inspiration, on their own intellectual, aesthetic and cultural resources many structures which drew encomium of contemporary sojourners in the country and still receive unstinted praise as jewels of architecture and masterpieces of sculpture. Fergusson's appraisal of two of the many temple-ruins of the Hoysala kings will have to speak for the quality of the architectural and sculptural performance of the pre-Vijayanagar Hindus, upset by the Muslim invasion which led to the foundation of the Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan. Fergusson<sup>86</sup> observes about the small temple of Kedareshvara at Halebid: "If this little temple had been illustrated in anything like completeness, there was probably nothing in India which would have conveyed a better idea of what its architects were capable of accomplishing." Of its neighbour the magnificent temple of Hoysaleswara the same authority goes even further and says: ". . . had it been completed, (it) is one of the buildings on which the advocate of Hindu architecture would desire to take his stand." Percy Brown writing in 1942 goes even further in his well-considered and criti-

<sup>83</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 266

<sup>84</sup> John Norman Hollister, *The Shia of India*, 1953, p. 106.

<sup>85</sup> *Op. cit.* II, pp. 67, 71, 74. Italics mine

<sup>86</sup> *Op. cit.* II, pp. 412, 441.

cally formulated judgement about it. He says: <sup>87</sup>

*The temple at Halebid is the supreme climax of Indian architecture in its most prodigal manifestation.* Even if its qualities of composition are not high, at least, as a monument of the phenomenal concentration, superb technical skill, ingenuity, imagination, and profound religious consciousness of those concerned in its creation, it has no peer.

The further fact to be carefully noted is that work on it was "probably stopped by the Muhammadan conquest in 1311 A.D."

Of the successor state of Vijayanagar the achievements in this field were more immense and not much inferior. Percy Brown's appreciation will suffice to put the matter in its proper perspective. Brown,<sup>88</sup> dilating on the rampant animal as a decorative element in South Indian architecture says:

That the armed forces of the Vijayanagar empire were of the finest calibre, inspired and led by rulers of great audacity and daring, is proved by the long period of two centuries during which they kept their hereditary foes at bay, whereas almost every other part of the country succumbed at once [?]. Something of this temper, a feeling of exultant invincibility—translated into the power of good over evil, seems embodied in the art of this period and accounts for these colonnades of splendid cavaliers nonchalantly astride gigantic rearing chargers and engaged in furious combat with fabulous creatures, an episode singularly analogous to that of St. George and the Dragon in the West.

The South thus had proclaimed through its architectural and sculptural activity that the Hindu was the sovereign of the land and that his artistic tradition, as developed and modified by his intellectuals, shall dominate over the land. The North, too, may be said to have sounded the same note through the sacred and civil architecture of her Hindu sons during the 17th, 18th and (the early part of) the 19th centuries, when the architectural impulse of the North Indian Muslims had shown itself to be on the wane. Brown,<sup>89</sup> pondering over the scene of the latter half of the 17th century opines that not only were the architectural productions of the Moghuls numerically less but also they were of a lower standard than those of the earlier rulers. Fergusson,<sup>90</sup> too, much earlier, convinced that architectural decadence of the Moghuls had set in long before the death of Aurangzeb, posed for himself and his readers the "curious and instructive subject of speculation to try to ascertain what would have been the

<sup>87</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, p. 169.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 109.

<sup>89</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 114.

<sup>90</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 330-31.

fate of Muhammadan architecture in India had no European influence been brought to bear upon it", which showed "downward progress" in remote corners, without any extraneous assistance. He says that in view of the European dominance the speculation is balked. From this statement and its manner we would have to conclude that it would have immensely deteriorated, though it would not have died.

In support of such a conclusion, Fergusson's<sup>11</sup> characterization of the Muslim architecture of the Nawabs of Oudh and of Tipu Sultan of Mysore as "bastard" may be mentioned. Further, Fergusson has carefully noted the fact that Tipu's palace at Srirangapatnam, called the Darya Daulat resembles "somewhat the nearly contemporary palace [of Surajmal Jat] at Dig in style, but is feebler and of a much less ornamental character".

Decadence was the hallmark of Muslim architecture almost all over the country in the second and third quarters of the 18th century, when Surajmal's palace at Dig, which has been described by Fergusson<sup>12</sup> as surpassing the fortified palaces of all Rajput states in "grandeur of conception and beauty of detail", was built. Small wonder that that great student of comparative art and architecture with all his supposed prejudice against Hindu art, should conclude his survey of the architecture of the Hindus, passing under review work of even the first quarter of the 19th century, with the observation :

*They [Hindus] long ago found out that it is not temples and palaces alone that are capable of such display, but that everything which man makes may become beautiful, provided the hand of taste be guided by sound judgment and that the architect never forgets what the object is, and never conceals the constructive exigencies of the building itself . . .*

But no one who has personally visited the objects of interest with which India abounds can fail to be struck with the extraordinary elegance of detail and propriety of design which pervades all the architectural achievements of the Hindus; and this is not only in buildings erected in former days, but in those now in course of construction in those parts of the country to which the bad taste of their European rulers has not yet penetrated.

;

So like the lotus leaf in water Hindu architecture and architectural talent have kept themselves above the water of dilution and untainted by it!

## CHAPTER

### 9

## MUSLIM FRUSTRATION

THE IDEA OF a separate Muslim nation carved out of British India is commonly ascribed to the year 1940. In March of that year the Muslim League of then India resolved that no constitutional plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is based on the principle that "geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute an 'Independent State', in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign". It also resolved "that adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in the regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them and in other parts of India where Mussalmans are in a minority adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quotation as in Mohammed Noman's *Muslim India*, 1942, pp. 404-5; W. Cantwell Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 1943, pp. 295-301; *Islam in Modern History*, 1957, pp. 209, 256, Humayun Kabir, *Muslim Politics*, 1943, pp. 44, 45, 47-8; Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, 2nd impression, 1946, p. 175; Ishtaq Husain Qureshi, *The Muslim Community of Indo-Pakistan Sub-continent*, 1962, pp. 297-99; Hafecz Malik, *Muslim Nationalism in India and Pakistan*, 1963, pp. 240-1; Aziz Ahmad, *Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, 1964, pp. 271-75; G. H. Mehkri, *Social Background of Hindu Muslim Relationship*, 1947, pp. 459-67 (unpublished Ph. D. thesis in the Library of the University of Bombay). G. H. Mehkri, a Muslim graduate of Mysore University, came to me, after having taken his Diploma of the Tata School of Social Work, as the present Tata Institute of Social Sciences was then known, in 1940, "being attracted", as he says in his Preface, "to serious study of Sociology, a subject with which I had but little acquaintance before." I suggested to him that he might attempt a thesis in Political Sociology by studying the social and historical background of the Hindu-Muslim problem. Working on it he submitted his thesis in 1947 and received

Serious students of the history of Muslim nationalism in India, like Ishtaq Husain Qureshi, Hafeez Malik, Aziz Ahmad, and W. C. Smith—the last one in his earlier work though rather hesitantly—were able to trace the origins of the idea of Pakistan or of a separate Muslim sovereign state out of British India to the utterances and exhortations of Muhammad Iqbal, the well-known Urdu poet of the Punjab. Ishtaq H. Qureshi<sup>2</sup> has quoted the following passage from Iqbal's presidential address to the Allahabad session of the Muslim League delivered on December 29, 1930:

I would like to see the Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India.<sup>1</sup>

Two out of the three Pakistani Muslim writers who stress this point of the origin of the idea of a separate Muslim sovereign state, viz., Hafeez Malik and Aziz Ahmad, however, rightly insist that the idea of Pakistan as it emerged ultimately in 1947 cannot be said to have been fashioned by Iqbal. But the fuller quotation of Iqbal's exposition of his glimmerings made by Dr G. H. Mehkri in his unpublished thesis (pp. 461-2) cannot leave any doubt that Iqbal's ideas and glimmerings, which he was pouring out at that time, were very much of the pattern that later led to the actual formation of Pakistan and India out of British India. Iqbal even adumbrated the need for a "redistribution of territory". The relevant passage quoted by Mehkri runs :

... it is clear that in view of India's infinite variety in climates, races, languages, creeds and social systems, the creation of autonomous states based on the unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests, is the only possible way to secure a stable constitutional structure in India.

Qureshi<sup>3</sup> has drawn attention to two earlier statements and advocacies,

his Doctorate just in time to enable him to take the most urgent and significant decision of opting out to Pakistan in pursuance of the conclusion he had presented in his thesis. Dr Mehkri was kind enough to remember me with great gratitude. For when later in 1953 or 1954 he had a few hours at his disposal at Santa Cruz Airport, on his way back to Pakistan from some seminar or symposium at Madras, he called on me and told me that the very next evening after his leaving Delhi for his Pakistan, the Muslim Mohalla where he was staying, after submission of his thesis, was the scene of a huge holocaust.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 297.

<sup>3</sup> W. C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, p. 294. Hafeez Malik, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-41; Aziz Ahmad, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-3.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 295-6.

one in 1920 by Muhammad Abdul Qadir Bilgrami of Badaun, and the other in 1923 by Sardar Muhammad Gul Khan of Dera Ismail Khan, in favour of the division of India between the Hindus and Muslims. The statement of Bilgrami, which was till 1925 twice issued as a pamphlet, gave a list of districts so to be distributed between the two peoples, "fundamentally not too different from the present boundaries of East and West Pakistan". Gul Khan's scheme apportioned the whole of the area from Peshawar to Agra to the Muslims. Mehkri<sup>5</sup> has obliged us by quoting the actual words of Gul Khan thus:

Hindu-Muslim unity will never become a *fait accompli* and they [the people of his view] think that this Province [North-West Frontier Province] should remain separate and a link between Islam and Britannic Commonwealth. In fact when I am asked what my opinion is—I, as a member of the Anjuman, am expressing this opinion—we should rather *see the separation of the Hindus and the Muhamadans, twenty-three crores of Hindus to the South eight crores of Muslims to the North. Give the whole portion from Raskumari [Cape Camorin] to Agra to the Hindus and from Agra to Peshawar to Muhamadans. I mean transmigration from one place to the other.*

Dr Mehkri's<sup>6</sup> researches, completed before 1947 and embodied in his thesis submitted in 1947, reached further in this matter than the later ones of the much older, much better placed, professor-administrator-diplomat Qureshi. He has unearthed the fact that it was as early as 1917 that two Indian Muslims, Professor Abdul Sattar Kheiri and Dr Abdul Jabbar Kheiri, had discussed at the Stockholm Socialist International Conference with M. C. Huysmans, the General Secretary of the Conference, a written statement regarding the partition of India into a Muslim India and a Hindu India.

The idea of partitioning British India into two Indias, Muslim and Hindu, appears to have been entertained by some leading or thinking Muslims of India almost from the time when the Montague-Chelmsford reforms to share with the people some responsibility in the governance of British India were being mooted. The basic source of the idea of partition was the conviction of these Muslims of India that they are a distinct nationality, characterized by *not only religion but language and culture as well as by particular economic interests*. There is also the strong urge based on the widespread and dearly cherished sentiment of the unity of Islamic peoples the world over and in particular of the close affinity with the whole block of Islamic nations of the Middle East.

<sup>5</sup> Mehkri, *op. cit.*, p. 458. Italics mine.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 455-57 — *Daun*, dated 24-5-42. The correspondence in 1941 which established this fact is said in the paper to have been carried through Earl Attlee.

The idea that the Muslims of India are a distinct nationality or "solidarity", having almost nothing in common with the Hindus of the country, excepting the fact of co-residence, is, however, not only much older but also was held and expressed by very eminent leaders of the Muslims of India, at least one of whom was in his days such a staunch Indian nationalist that he was the President of the Indian National Congress in 1923 held at Kakinada. And he was one of the most dynamic products of Aligarh Muslim University, Maulana Mohamed Ali, who, finding it impossible to get the Aligarh University on the side of the nationalist non-cooperation and of the Khilafat movement, founded in 1920 a new Muslim National University named Jamia Millia Islamia at Aligarh, which afterwards having been transferred to Delhi has continued its more or less vigorous existence there.

Maulana Mohamed Ali in his speech during the Fourth Plenary Session of the Round Table Conference in London, which happened to be almost his last speech, as he died in London soon after, said:<sup>7</sup> "... I have a culture, a polity, an outlook on life a complete synthesis which is Islam . . . *I belong to two circles of equal size but which are not concentric. One is India, and the other is the Muslim world. . . We as Indian Muslims come in both the circles. We belong to these two circles, each of more than 300 millions [one of them the non-Indian in a slightly later context he represented as being 400 millions instead of 300 as here] and we can leave neither. . .* If that feeling which writes 'Revenge' so large over the politics of certain people in India existed as it does and if it existed to the extent which it does to-day and the Muslims were everywhere a minority of 25 per cent and the Hindus everywhere a majority of 66 per cent [mark his spontaneous or calculated exclusion of the Scheduled Castes from the Hindus!], I would see no ray of hope to-day; but *thanks to the jerry-mandering of our saints and our soldiers, if there are provinces . . . in which I am only 4 per cent, there are other provinces where I am 93 per cent. There is the old province of Sind where the Muslims first landed, where they are 73 per cent; in the Punjab they are 56 per cent and in Bengal they are 55 per cent. That gives us our safeguard for we demand hostages as we have willingly given hostages to Hindus in other provinces where they form huge majorities—I want you to realise that for the first time you are introducing a big revolution in India; for the first time majority rule is to be introduced into India. . .* For the first time in India we are going to introduce majority rule—I am prepared to submit to majority rule. *Luckily however there are Muslim majorities in certain provinces . . .*"

The idea of creating an independent sovereign Muslim State out of British India, its probable extent in territory, and the solution of the problem of the Muslim minority in the remnant territory to be demarcated as the

<sup>7</sup> W. C. Smith (1), pp. 147, 238; Aziz Ahmad, pp. 268-273; Mehkri, *op. cit.*, pp. 304-10, Ishtaq H. Qureshi, *op. cit.*, p. 103, f.n. Italics mine.



Hindu State through transportation [exchange?] of populations was present in the minds of at least some prominent and many thinking Muslims of India even before the arrival of the Simon Commission and long before the probability of complete transfer of power from the British to the local population could be envisaged. In order that the nature and extent of frustration that must have been caused to the Muslims by the final result of the British leave-taking in 1947 may be fully appraised, it must be noted that the leader from the North Western Province, the first to express the heart's desire of the Muslims of British India, who thought in terms of purely Indian Muslim nationalism, specified the limits of his Pakistan as extending to Agra from the west. He did not, it seems, specify the southern limit whereto his "Muslimistan" was to extend. But we would be justified in inferring that he had in view some territory of both present Rajasthan and Gujarat as constituting a portion of the Muslim State!

The heaven of the idea, both in the abstract of a separate nationality of the Muslims and in the concrete of some specific part or parts of India as their homeland or homelands, and the State or States or the federation of States had begun to work. We see its actual effect in a number of schemes put up by Muslims of India, both political leaders and intellectuals, i.e., Professors in the Universities. And we shall have to study these to understand the aspirations of the Muslims of India on the eve of the Second World War and of the resolution of the Lahore Session of the Muslim League.

Unsatisfied aspirations cause frustration, the strength and extent of which is determined by the nature and extent of the aspirations.

The credit for putting up a comprehensive scheme of securing the interests and the aspirations of the Muslims of India, who were convinced that they formed a separate nation from the rest of the Indians, in the new constitution that would have to be set up in fulfilment of the partially implemented Act of 1935, which introduced Provincial autonomy, goes to a group of young Muslim students\* studying in England. They prepared a pamphlet entitled *Now or Never*, signed by Rahmat Ali, Sheikh Mohamed Sadiq, Inayatullah Khan, and Mohamed Aslam Khan, and privately circulated it among the members [Muslim?] of the Round Table Conference in London in 1933. The main contents of the pamphlet as quoted by Dr. Mehkri in his unpublished thesis, (preserved in the library of the University of Bombay) (pp. 462-3) are:

1. The signatories "On behalf of 'our' thirty million Muslim brethren who live in Pakistan [this appears to be the earliest use of this term for the Muslim State that was being mooted or propounded in the later thirties and the early 'forties'] — viz. the Punjab, North-West Frontier Provinces, (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan" "protest-

\* Rajendra Prasad, *op. cit.*, pp. 187, 207.

ed against the federal constitution then in process of being framed by the Round Table Conference, and repudiated the claim of the Indian Muslim delegation to speak for their community."

2. "India is not the name of a single country nor the home of one single nation. It is in fact the designation of a state created for the first time in history by the British."

3. "We [the Muslims] do not inter-dine, we do not inter-marry [with the 'others in India']. Our *national* customs and calenders, even our diet and dress are different."

4. The Muslims of Pakistan "are a *distinct nation*, with a homeland twice the size of France and a population equal to the French"; they demanded for them "the recognition of a separate national status".

5. They differed from Iqbal who was prepared for a single Federation of all Indian units, however loose, and proposed that the Provinces mentioned earlier "should have a separate Federation of their own."

6. They remarked, "*There can be no peace and tranquility in this land if we, the Muslims, are duped into a Hindu Federation where we cannot be the masters of our own destiny and captains of our own souls.*"

The first full-fledged plan for securing the separatist interests of the Muslims of India was framed and published in 1938 under the pseudonym "A Punjabi". The author's real name was Nawab Sir Shah Nawaz Khan.<sup>9</sup> In his booklet, the knight advocated the division of India into five "countries", each one of which was to be a federation evidently of the existing units, appropriately trimmed and grouped. The five "countries" or federations were to be reassembled into a "Confederacy of India". The book itself was entitled *Confederacy of India*.<sup>10</sup> The five federations, each of which differed not only in the extent of its area and the number of its population but also in the number of federating units within it, were:

1. Sind, Baluchistan, North-West Frontier Province, Punjab with the exception of the Eastern Hindu tracts comprising the Ambala Division, Kangra District and Una and Garhashankar Tahsils of the Hoshiarpur District, and the Indian States of Amb, Bahawalpur, Chitral, Dir, Kalat, Kapurthala, Khairpur, Las Bela and Malerkotla. It was to be named "Industan";

2. The United Provinces, Bihar, Assam, some portions of Bengal, Orissa, Madras and Bombay and the Indian States, "other than Rajasthan and Deccan States included in the Deccan States' Federation". It was named the Hindu India Federation. The specification of the States to be the constituents of this federation is rather vague; but I think it must be construed to include in the Hindu India Federation, not only Travancore and Cochin but also Patiala and Kashmir. Anyway, as Kashmir

<sup>9</sup> Mehkri, *op cit*, p. 461

<sup>10</sup> Rajendra Prasad, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-81.

is not mentioned as one of the units of the Indus-stan Federation there is no doubt that it was included in this Federation;

3. All the States of Rajputana and Central India, the Federation being named the Rajastan Federation;

4. The States of Hyderabad, Mysore and Bastar, the Federation being called the Deccan States' Federation;

5. Muslim tracts of Eastern Bengal, viz., Dinajpur, Rangpur, Malda, Bogra, Rajshahi, Murshidabad, Patna, Mymensingh, Nadia, Jessore, Faridpur, Dacca, Tippera, Naokhali, Bakarganj, Khulna and Chittagong, Goalpara and Sylhet districts of Assam, and Tripura and other States lying within the provincial unit [of Bengal] or "cut off by its territories from Hindu India". It was straightforwardly called *The Bengal Federation*.

The first and the fifth Federations are quite clearly the Muslim majority ones, the former i.e., "Indus-stan" having more than 80 per cent of Muslims in its population, and the latter, the Bengal Federation, having 66 per cent.

The fourth Federation, the Deccan States' Federation is a rather curious formation. Hyderabad State, otherwise then known as the Dominions of His Exalted Highness the Nizam, who was counted as an ally of His Britannic Majesty and was looked upon as an almost independent power, and a grown-up and spreading tree from a Moghul sapling from Imperial Delhi,<sup>11</sup> should *ipso facto* figure and it is seen that it does so in all schemes—as an independent unit to be brought into the confederacy of India through its own sovereign or semi-sovereign will.

What about the other two States, one a first-class modernized Hindu State, Mysore, and the other a backward tribal State, Bastar? One may see some logic in their enforced alignment with Hyderabad because the latter is contiguous immediately on the north-east of the boundary of Hyderabad and the other similarly situated on the south, the Hindu territory involved on the two boundaries being negligibly small in extent. Bastar with its tribal population, its backward condition and its British administration at the time could be an easy addition capable of augmenting not only the prestige of Hyderabad and its Nizam but also the number of future Muslims. Mysore was pressed into the scheme evidently because being under the actual stewardship of a suave and successful Muslim statesman as the Diwan of the State, it could be roped in to enhance the Nizam's importance and consequently the prestige of a Federation, which in effect would be a third Muslim Federation, comprised within the Confederacy of India, giving the whole Confederacy the look and the effect of

<sup>11</sup> Syed A. Latif, *The Muslim Problem in India*, 1939, p. 25. Syed Z. Hasan and Mohammad A. H. Qadri, *The Problem of Indian Muslims and its Solution*, 1939, p. 7; Sir Syed Sultan Ahmad, *A Treaty Between India and the United Kingdom*, 1944, p. 97; Ishtaq H. Qureshi, *op. cit.*, pp. 173, 175; Aziz Ahmad, *Studies in Islamic Culture*, etc., 1964, p. 54.

a Muslim one in actual practice. A third and perhaps the most important consideration which must have weighed with the formulator of the scheme is the historical fact of Mysore having been a Muslim kingdom ruled over by Tipu Sultan, at whose death in 1799 the British had handed it over to the Hindu king. And Tipu had proclaimed a *jihad*, religious war, against the British.<sup>12</sup> The kingdom that belonged to a Muslim—the fact that his father had usurped it could be easily glossed over as an act of piety as it is the duty of a pious or devout Muslim to change any country or area not under the rule of an Islamic monarch or people into one having such a ruler, to make it a Dar-ul-Islam<sup>13</sup>—is the rightful inheritance of an Islamic ruler though of another area!

We have to count the area of what is euphemistically called the Deccan States' Federation by "A Punjabi" but what is, in reality, the Hyderabad Federation under the auspices or hegemony of Muslim Hyderabad, being under a Muslim-dominated State. Merging this area with the two expressly and avowedly proclaimed Muslim States we have in round number an area of about 594,000 square miles \* of Indian soil, i.e., nearly 37.9 per cent of India, handed over to and secured under Muslim domination in this plan! The population which this Muslim-dominated area was to accommodate formed hardly even 27 per cent of the whole! The Muslim population of the three Federations together accounted for about 65.2 per cent of the total Muslim population of India, leaving a little less than 35 per cent in the two Hindu Federations wherein they would form hardly 10.8 per cent of the total population of the Federations.

The less than 15 million Hindu-Sikh population, in the two Muslim Federation States on the two strategic sides of India, forming about 14 per cent of the total population in the Western Muslim State and about 33 per cent in the Eastern one, could be thrown out of them rather sooner than later. Western Pakistan in actual fact was almost cleared of Hindu-Sikh population before 1961. From Eastern Pakistan by the end of 1956 four million Hindus had been forced to migrate to India, and by 1965 two million more at least must have done so, leaving at best only about 40 per cent of the non-Muslims who were included in it at its formation! Thus about 65 per cent of the Muslims, forming only about 15.7 per cent of the total population of India of 1946, would have secured to itself 28 per cent of the area of that India, and that, too, out of the rather superior lot!

The less than two million Muslims of the Hyderabad or the Deccan States' Federation with the highly diplomatic, influential, and fabulously

<sup>12</sup> Ishtaq H. Qureshi, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-5; Aziz Ahmad, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-4; *The Cambridge Shorter History of India*, pp. 584, 604; W. C. Smith (2), p. 278.

<sup>13</sup> W. C. Smith (1) pp. 6, 234; (2) p. 30, f.n. 27; Hafeez Malik, *Moslem Nationalism etc.*, pp. 3, 153, 160-2, 164-5, 187.

\* Both the area and the population figures are those of the author of the plan as supplemented or corrected by Bhairata Ratna Dr Rajendra Prasad in his book *India Divided*.

rich Nizam getting richer as its head could be trusted to maintain the *status quo* in a dignified and confident manner. And within about a generation, through the very much greater natural increase of the Muslims aided by continuous and large immigration of Muslims from the two frontier Muslim Federations, the size of the Muslim component of the Federation could be trusted to be respectable. If parity could be established within the next two generations, as it could be with appropriate incentives and migration, the stage could well be set for the complete cutting off and hemming in of the two Hindu Federations. Such were the potentialities of the rather rational-looking plan of "A Punjabi", playing on the Congress sentiment against "separation to-day" of the two nationalities. They provide the measure of the aspirations of a large section of Muslims of India in 1938!

In 1938 Syed Abdul Latif, who was formerly a professor in the Osmania University of Hyderabad and later the Director of the Institute of Islamic Culture at Hyderabad, had published a pamphlet styled the *Cultural Future of India*, in which he had suggested the creation of a federation of culturally homogeneous states for India as a likely lasting solution of "the age-long and vexed Hindu-Muslim problem". A year later he brought out his book the *Muslim Problem in India* embodying in it an alternative constitution for India—alternative of course to the one envisaged in the Act of 1935—which the sponsor of the book, Sir Abdulla Haroon of the Muslim League, described as "a sort of amendment to the Act of 1935".

Syed Abdul Latif, whom Sir Abdulla Haroon characterized as "scholar and thinker", informs his readers of the reaction of Mahatma Gandhi to his pamphlet which envisaged "the possibility of the two cultures [Hindu and Muslim] blending" and his own counter-reaction to it. It made him pause and seriously think over the question, "*Could the two cultures, such as they are, so blend into each other as to create a composite nationality for India?*" He registers his reply to it in Chapter IV of his book. He denies that there has any time arisen a common culture in post-Muslim India. He says, (p. 14) ". . . in spite of our talk of a common Indian culture, *two great currents of life, two great social orders, two great cultures subsist side by side . . . owing allegiance to two fundamentally different faiths.*" Without the blending of the two cultures, and the blending of the two religions is an impossibility, because one of them is "a monotheism manifesting itself in a democratic order of life [Islam]" and the other [Hinduism] is "a symbolism or polytheism which strikes at the very root of the democratic sense in man". The Hindu-Muslim problem, therefore, remained to Dr Latif a culture problem which is capable of solution only on two conditions: (1) *cultural autonomy to each Indian nationality or community*, and (2) *political unity for India*. Federation of culturally homogeneous states of India "is the only scheme that accommodates these conditions and ensures peaceful relations between the *two countries*" to be formed out of

India. The plan of Pakistan, a sovereign State formed out of the five provinces, including Kashmir, of the north-west formulated by some earlier writer does not take into account the needs and the fate of the Muslims living as a minority in the rest of India. Therefore that plan as well as the more developed ones like the one which envisaged "Bengassam—it is clear that the scheme Dr Latif has in view as the target of his criticism is the one which was put up in a booklet by "A Punjabi", who was no other than Nawab Sir Shah Nawaz Khan, in 1938 under the title *Confederacy of India* already dealt with"<sup>1</sup> does not find favour with Dr Latif.

Dr Latif proposed that India should be divided into not less than 14 zones, each being culturally more or less homogeneous. Four of these shall be for Muslims, cultural homogeneity being wherever necessary procured by territorial adjustments, and the rest for the Hindus. The Indian States spread over the country were proposed to be accommodated in the different zones "in accordance with their natural affinities".

The four Muslim Cultural zones then are listed as, (1) North-West Block; (2) North-East Block; (3) Delhi-Lucknow Block and (4) The Deccan Block.

(1) The North-West Block was to be "converted into a single autonomous State", its six component units, viz., Sind, Baluchistan, Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, the State of Khairpur and the State of Bahawalpur, being its federating units, "thereby allowing", in the words of Professor Latif, "over 25 millions of Muslims a free home of their own". Evidently the Sikhs and Hindus who formed at least 11 per cent of the population, and even others who on the authority of "A Punjabi" must have composed about 4 per cent, i.e., altogether about 18 per cent of the total population which was non-Muslim, were to Dr Latif as if they did not exist. Otherwise the Muslims though 82 per cent could not be said to have "a free home". They could be said to have a Muslim majority or Muslim-dominated State!

(2) The North-East Block of Dr Latif comprises only Eastern Bengal and has the whole of Assam in it on the incorrect or rather misleading plea that they together make "a solid block of Muslims of over 30 millions". In the map accompanying the book the city of Calcutta is shown as part of this East Bengal. Dr Latif has not named the districts.

(3) The Delhi-Lucknow Block was to extend "from the Eastern border of Patiala to Lucknow, rounding up Rampur on the way". In it were to be concentrated "the great bulk [of Muslims] belonging at present to the United Province and Bihar numbering about 12 millions." As the map shows it, it also encompasses the great industrial city of Kanpur (Cawnpore) and the older capital of the Muslims, Agra with its Taj. Aligarh and Deoband without being named can be understood to be included well within the block.

The explanatory comment of the author on the genesis of this block, which

<sup>1</sup> Syed A. Latif, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-8. Italics mine.

places all the cities important in the Muslim history of Northern India at the disposal of a Muslim State and engulfs, *inter alia*, "Kurukshetra" and the tract where the Panchalas ruled, almost the most hallowed region in ancient Indian, Vedic and post-Vedic Epic history and culture, within a Muslim State is very curious. It would automatically blot out the glorious endeavour of the early Hindus at philosophizing and at politically organizing the country. No wonder, if Dr Latif conceived the creation of this block as the completion of the task his Islamic ancestors had undertaken, and had nearly accomplished but had failed to reap the final fruit of, i.e., their arduous endeavour to convert the population of that region to Islam,—in spite of the rigorous rule they imposed over it for almost six to seven centuries! If Dr Latif's plan or anything much like it had gone through, Dr Latif, and I too along with him, would have ejaculated the common but not true saying, "Pen is mightier than the sword!"

Dr Latif's explanatory comment portrays him and his community as rather lenient and obliging to the Hindu-community. He had "carved out", i.e., he had proposed the "carving out" of the particular zone, the block in that region, so as "to allow the Hindu nationality to keep within its zone all its great religious centres like Benares, Hardwar, Allahabad and Muttra". Shifting it to any area in the North other than the one specified, he coolly asserts, would "defeat that purpose". He ignores, and evidently thinks that his Hindu readers, too, will cooperate with him in this, that this Muslim zone lies athwart between Hardwar and Mathura (Muttra) on the one hand, and both these sacred Hindu spots and the other two sacred places, Allahabad and Varanasi (Benares) on the other. He conveniently forgets that leaving out all these sacred cities of the Hindus he could give the Muslims in the North a block equally large, east of Varanasi (Benares), "rounding-up", to use his expression, "in the way" the Muslim State of Bhopal. But then it would not be contiguous to the first Muslim zone, the North-West Block, enabling the Muslims to have one zone, made up by combining the two, the first and the third, big enough to be larger than any single Hindu zone out of the eleven assigned by him to that community. Further such a zone would have defeated the fulfilment of the old Muslim idea and ideal of Islam ruling over the whole region of Asia that stretches from far-famed Baghdad, the early centre of Islamic civic glory, to Delhi and Lucknow, the later and newer ones, created and nurtured by the brains and hands of the followers of Islam deriving their inspiration from the Khalifs of old Baghdad!

(4) The Deccan block is formed to meet the special position of the Muslims below the Vindhyas and the Satpuras. There they are scattered in "colonies of varying size and exceed 12 millions in number". Dr Latif speaks here as if they are not scattered in North India, i.e., in Gujarat north of the Tapi (Tapti), Rajasthan, U.P., Madhya Pradesh and Bihar! But as he was to "carve a zone for them" he must represent their case as deserving

special consideration and solution, in as innocuous a fashion as possible and without divulging the underlying motives, which are bound to stiffen the backs of the Hindus! The truth is that, as "A Punjabi" quite frankly stated in the first plan for constitutional arrangement we have noted above, the Muslims looked upon the Nizam of Hyderabad and his Dominions as not only the virtual descendants of the last of the Moghuls of Delhi and their Empire but also as the last Muslim power still existing, from which the Muslim domination over India passed to the British. Their logic in this arrangement, as also in all others, is that the Nizam as the last representative of the glory of Muslim rule in India is entitled to be reinstated in his full glory, in which he shone before the British annihilated the newer Muslim glory of Tipu Sultan and divested the Nizam of some of his dominions, i.e., Berar, and parts of the region south and south-east of the Hyderabad State stretching upto Madras, known for about two centuries as the Carnatic. Such a claim, rightful in the eyes of the Muslims of India, enabled the Dominions, the fourth Muslim block, to be sizeable and quite strong—in the circumstances of the monarchical rule and almost feudal atmosphere of the state—a richer and more powerful Muslim state than any of the other three Muslim blocks and capable of effectively checking the Hindu blocks in their possible aggrandisement, and even in their routine progress. Therefore the Hyderabad State, though a region with more than 82,000 square miles of area, is to be considered as not capable of accommodating the 12 million Muslims. The total population of Hyderabad State in the year, in which Dr Latif brought out his "old well-considered plan and his newer constitution for India", could not have been less than 15 millions, only a few hundred thousand of whom were Muslims. The States Re-organization Committee, writing in 1955, put its population at 18.7 millions, of whom, to judge by the percentage of Urdu-speakers, the Muslims could not have numbered more than two million.<sup>15</sup>

The strip of territory in the South which Dr Latif would have "restored" to the Muslims is specified rather vaguely as "running through the districts of Kurnool, Cuddapah, Chittoor, North Arcot and Chingleput down to the city of Madras".<sup>16</sup> In his map Dr Latif has shown Madras city as imbedded in this so-called "strip", so that about 20 miles north and 20 miles south was the spread of this strip. From this I infer that all the four districts, Kurnool, Cuddapah, Chittoor, North Arcot and Chingleput, plus the industrial city of Madras were to form part of Dr Latif's Deccan Muslim Block or, as we should say, of the Muslim Dominion of His Exalted Highness, the Nizam! This tract, known as the Carnatic, formed a part, in earlier history, of the glorious Hindu Empire of Vijayanagar. With one stroke of pen Dr Latif was achieving two great ends for him and for the Muslims of India. He was reviving the glories of the Nizam and the Moghul Empire

<sup>15</sup> *Report of the States Re-organization Committee*, p. 101.

<sup>16</sup> Latif, *op. cit.*, p. 31.



immediately, and was in the process, blotting out the Hindu past of Vijayanagar glory. The third objective Dr Latif would have gained was to drive a powerful Muslim wedge through the East and the South-west.

In order to recommend his plan as fairly reasonable and equitable Dr Latif uses four pleas, through three of which his real objective in "carving out" this Muslim block, and in fact all the other blocks, whether Muslim zones or Hindu zones, peeps out.

The first reason for the addition of the so-called "strip" to the then existing State of Hyderabad is that "an opening to the sea will be found absolutely necessary, to settle the large Muslim mercantile and marine community living for ages on the Coromandel and Malabar Coasts". This reason is not as clinching as Dr Latif thought. Why could that community—which, even "large" as Dr Latif has it, could not have numbered more than two million—not be accommodated in the still older resorts of the Islamic community in Sindh with Karachi as the great maritime port or in Calcutta which Dr Latif claimed for the Eastern Muslim block? Since Dr Latif wrote, Calcutta has accommodated at least four million people, though under the dispensation of Pakistani partition they are mostly Hindus! Or why could the port of Chittagong not be developed through the great enterprise of that "large Muslim community of the Malabar and Coromandel coasts"? There is no answer. As a matter of fact Dr Latif was so far gone in wishful thinking by the time he had gone through his second Muslim block that he seems to have been oblivious of the situation that there was at least one party, the Hindus, if not two, the other being the British, who had to agree to his scheme whatever its "merits" in the eyes of its formulator, or rather, creator!

The second reason is that the creation of the Deccan Block in the manner advocated by Dr Latif is in appearance an altruistic one. For as Dr Latif assures his Hindu readers it will "allow the *fullest autonomous existence to five distinct Hindu nationalities with exclusive [?] boundaries of their own*".\* The five "distinct Hindu nationalities" of Dr Latif are: The "Maharatta", the "Canarese", the "Malayali", the "Tamilian" and the "Andhra". The speakers of Kannada, Marathi and Telugu, who were the citizens and hoarily long-settled pre-Muslim inhabitants of Hyderabad region, were to be graciously moved from their habitations in the Hyderabad State, and I take it also from the newer area, to their respective States, the three of the eleven Hindu zones, and the so-called "strip" added to it to form the Deccan Muslim Block, and the twelve million Muslims of the South implanted in their place. This device, as the third reason advanced by Dr Latif has it, will "*restore to them [the Muslims of the Peninsula] the historic consciousness that they are the common inheritors of the Muslim culture that developed and flourished here for centuries consummating*

\* Italics mine. I doubt the correctness of the last statement to show which I have introduced the question-mark.

[culminating?] in the time of the Moguls when the whole of this area formed part of a single Suba [?].<sup>17</sup>

Dr Latif carefully refrains from pointing out or even referring to the double-purpose nature of the device. The other purpose, the covert one, is that it *ipso facto* establishes a purely Islamic, Urdu-speaking State, and blots out all possible reminiscences of the glorious Hindu period still current in parts of that region!

The fourth reason advanced, slightly apologetically, (?) is that "the Muslims of the South" have shown a tendency for "phenomenal increase" and that it is their birthright in transference (?) that the new region should provide for that unmistakable, (and in Dr Latif's opinion) inevitable and inescapable phenomenon. That is the reason why we are asked to appreciate the additional demand for the new "strip" of territory for only 12 million Muslims. Dr Latif, of course, does not mention the fact, noted above, that there were within Hyderabad State more Hindus than the 12 millions who were to be replaced by Muslims. On the other hand, he insists—I do not think he has any authority for it—that "large portions of the Dominions of Hyderabad are still undeveloped or rather covered by either forests or barren rocky tracts". Feeling, in spite of his apparent cocksureness, in his heart of hearts that his arguments will not carry conviction, he offers another consideration, purely from the Muslim point of view, showing his unlimited aspirations, in fact his objective to get not less than half of India, and that too in the better part of the country, for about 25 per cent of the total population, which was the number of Muslims proposed and stated by Dr Latif to be accommodated through his scheme. He asserts that not only the North-East Block, in which he has engulfed Assam and Calcutta, but also the newly "carved out" Delhi-Lucknow block are too narrow a zone to allow elbow room to his fast-growing Muslims. And he has provided a solution for this in his plan. His Deccan, which must appear to all fair minds to be too large for the population actually proposed to be planted therein, will provide "a settlement for the surplus population from these blocks".

By all manner of reasoning and facts, right or wrong, more incorrect than correct, he disavows, in the end, all "thought of making Hyderabad a homeland for Muslims" on the ground that it is the domain of a Muslim ruler! Dr Latif who speaks of "strip" of territory upto Madras and in his map engulfs Madras, never once mentioning the fact distinctly, goes one better in silently appropriating Berar to the Deccan Muslim block, showing it in his map as a Muslim protectorate, i.e., of course a protectorate of the Nizam, from whom the British had taken it away as on lease, and for the restoration of which almost two generations of effort of the Muslim house of Hyderabad and its loyal statesmen-supporters had tried their level best.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Latif, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

<sup>18</sup> C. H. Philips, *The Evolution of India and Pakistan, 1858 to 1947, Select Docu-*

This feature alone, if pointed out plainly, should convince anyone that Dr Latif's pleading is too specious to be given the credit for either fairness or sound logic!

The four blocks do not exhaust the areas which are to be wholly Muslim, though in the general statement Dr Latif<sup>19</sup> starts with the affirmation of four "cultural" (?) zones for them. Before dealing with his other proposals which involve further Muslim centres we have to make certain items in the total scheme quite clear and explicit.

1. Dr Latif clean forgets or ignores, for he could not have believed that there were no Assamese Hindus, though from his way of speaking about West Bengal, with a portion of Bihar added on to it, as "a zone exclusively for the Bengali Hindus" it is clear that there would be complete exchange of populations between East Bengal and West Bengal, transferring all the Bengali Hindus to West Bengal and all the Bengali Muslims to East Bengal!

2. When Dr Latif speaks of the Hindustan block of the Hindus and the Delhi-Lucknow block of the Muslims he makes it quite clear that the Muslims of Rajputana and Malwa are not included in any of the three Muslim Blocks of the North. Nor are the Sindh Hindus and the Sikhs and Hindus of the Punjab accommodated in respective linguistic blocks, though they would naturally be turned out of their existing homes in Sindh and Punjab.

3. Though there is no mention of Kashmiri language and a home for its speakers Dr Latif has provided for them in his scheme for the 11th zone, which ought to be really called the Kashmiri-Sikh-Punjabi zone but which he<sup>20</sup> calls the Hindu-Sikh zone. The formation of this zone involving transference of territory from one administration to another, division of Kashmir State, and of course exchange of populations, is the most curious formation in the whole scheme of Dr Latif. But of this later.

Here first of all must be pointed out a significant feature of the whole scheme: though almost all the Indian States under Hindu Princes are amalgamated with their respective zones or into linguistic zones, Kashmir alone is left out for special treatment.

The underlying reasons for this procedure appear to be at least four:

1. Though a Hindu-prince-State, Kashmir is preponderantly Muslim in populace, being the exact counterpart of Hyderabad, which though a Muslim-prince-State is predominantly Hindu in population. It is thus a counterpoise. If Hyderabad is to be the centre of a Muslim Block or zone, Kashmir on parity of reasoning and of seemingly fair dealing should be a

ments, 1962, pp. 428-31.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

Hindu Block to some extent at least. So a part of it, perhaps a little smaller than the area occupied by Pakistan at present, is to be cut off for the Muslim Block of the North-West to accommodate the Muslims of the State; and a part in the Kangra valley in the south-east of the State and contiguous with some of the Hindu-Sikh States of the Punjab, which are grouped with this portion of Kashmir, i.e., Jammu, to form the eleventh zone of non-Muslims, is to be cleared off the few Muslims and to be joined to this Hindu-Sikh zone.

2. The Sikhs of the Punjab and the Punjab States being confined to this zone, in which the many States forming its units are scattered in the midst of a strong Muslim Block, will have to contend both with Kashmir Hindus and Punjabi Hindus on the score of language, and the zone itself, unlike any other of the fifteen or twenty zones,—every one of which excepting perhaps one is to be unilingual—being bilingual, would be automatically rendered innocuous and kept weak.

3. Without accommodating the Sikhs and Hindus of the Punjab fairly near their current habitations Dr Latif could not present a fairly logical front for his proposal and insistence that the Delhi-Lucknow Block to be created was the most natural homeland for the Muslims of U.P. and Bihar. And unless a case for these Muslims to be located in the Delhi-Lucknow region was established, the more natural and rational claim of the Sikhs and the Hindus of the Punjab to remain established in Eastern Punjab, with Amritsar as its almost extreme west, as in the present partitional dispensation, could not be set aside, Jammu being the additional bait to attract them. My submission that this third reason must have been among the guides of Dr Latif in the process of the formation of this non-Muslim zone gains strength from the manner in which he brings in the Sindh Hindus and divides them, or rather asks them to divide themselves as best as they can, almost by the back-door, in his explanation of his 11th Hindu zone. The Sindh Hindus he says<sup>21</sup> “may be assigned to the adjacent Hindu zones of Gujrat and Rajputana”.

4. Though as stated above Dr Latif groups the States of Rajputana as the Hindu Zone to be named “Rajastan”—with his Perso-Arabic “t” and not the Hindu (Sanskrit) “th” as in our “Rajasthan” !—he leaves out the Muslim States of Rajputana and also of Malwa and Saurashtra and Gujrat (?).

With these items got clear, one begins to wonder what is to happen to the Muslims of Gujarat, Rajputana, Malwa and Orissa. Dr Latif forgot the Muslims of Orissa altogether! But the others he provides for in what he calls “Minor Muslim Centre” but which in his actual elaboration shows itself to be more than half a dozen, nay almost a dozen, Muslim centres scattered strategically in the midst of Hindu zones. He tells us that these

<sup>21</sup> *Op cit.*, p. 34.

Muslims would or "need to be concentrated in the Muslim States of Bhopal, Junagadh, Tonk, Jaora and others" by which of course, Palanpur almost at the eastern extremity of the Rann of Cutch, and Cambay, at the eastern limit of Saurashtra, are to be understood. Ajmir is to be constituted a "Free City". Whatever is meant by this expression, I take it that the plain result is to turn it into a Muslim centre from which Hindus have to go away. Thus at least 10 to 12 Muslim centres—States, Blocks or zones, conveniently distributed in the two Hindu zones of Rajasthan and Gujarat, and at least one other at the meeting-point of the three Hindu zones of Rajasthan, Hindusthan and Maharashtra, would be provided as rallying grounds and crystallizing units for the major Muslim zones, as an effective check on Hindu progress, even normal, not to speak of aggrandizement!

*Inter alia*, this arrangement gives the Muslims at least one more port on the Western coast in addition to Karachi. With three good ports on the eastern side, Madras, Calcutta, and Chittagong, in the service and command of the Muslim zones, which can at any later time certainly join hands and act as one Muslim State, the Hindu zones with all their number and combination could be hemmed in and jammed!

These zones, it is not clear if the 10 or 12 Muslim States-centres were to count as one zone or twelve for purposes of federation,—were to form an All-India Federation. Thus India was to be a Federation of not less than 15 units of which at least 5 were to be Muslim units. Further details are not given, nor are they clear. For our purpose it does not much matter. For we can take it that units which go into a federation can get out of it and that nothing could prevent the Muslim zones or the Hindu zones going out of the Federation. How the author,<sup>22</sup> almost at the end could emphasize as a particular merit of his plan that "it leaves the Indian States intact, even as they are to-day, to enjoy wherever necessary a common regional and cultural life with contiguous territory possessing common affinities" I cannot understand. It appears to me that the wishful thinking of the author ultimately blinded him completely!

The above plan gives Dr Latif's ultimate solution. For the transitional period he made a number of detailed proposals which are all in the interests of Muslims during the interval and designed to gain the ultimate objective. As my purpose is not to examine the practicability or otherwise from the politician's or administrator's point of view but only to present the concrete aspirations of Muslim intellectuals and/or political leaders, I shall not enter into them and pass on to other schemes outlining the Muslim aspirations.

Syed Zafarul Hasan and Mohammad Afzal Husain Qadri, both Professors in the Aligarh Muslim University at the time,\* in their efforts to put

<sup>22</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 38.

\* Year not available in their brochure entitled *The Problem of Indian Muslims and its Solution*.

up a solution to the problem of Indian Muslims, combined the training and traditions of Oxford and Cambridge, worked out a more separatist scheme. For they saw that the Federation of 15 or 16 units, of which not more than 5 or 6 could be Muslim ones, still placed the Hindus in the advantageous position in which they were to be, according to them, if the Constitution of the Act of 1935 was to be operative. Further they were opposed to large-scale exchange of population, ostensibly on the score of impracticability of such an operation. It is not unlikely, however, that they sensed the real danger in accepting such a proposal to be disadvantageous in terms of territory. For once the principle of exchange is accepted, territory can be apportioned strictly on the basis of the number of persons involved and on no other consideration.\* The 92 million Muslims forming not even 24 per cent of the total population of the country could not get nearly 15 per cent of the area of the whole, as they were claiming in Dr Latif's scheme! To appeal to their co-religionists and to dissuade them from accepting such a proposal they put forward the argument that "*total denudation of Hindustan from Islamic influences . . . would contravene the very mission of Islam in the world and its spirit of expansion.*"<sup>21</sup>

They preface their solution with five principles on which "the Muslims of India must insist persistently and strenuously". They are:

1. *The Muslims of India are a "nation by themselves", and have "a distinct national entity—wholly different from the Hindus and other non-Muslim groups";*

2. *They have a separate national future;*

3. *That future lies "in a complete freedom from the domination of the Hindus" and others;*

4. *The Muslim majority provinces must not be permitted to be engulfed into a single All-India Federation with an overwhelming Hindu majority in the Centre; and*

5. *"The Muslims in the minority provinces shall not be allowed to be deprived of their separate religious, cultural and political identity" and "they shall be given full and effective support by the Muslim majority provinces."*\*\*

They divided British India into three "wholly independent and sovereign states". The princely States or the so-called Native States, with the sole exception of Hyderabad, were to form part of one of these three Sovereign States according as they are either within any of them or exclusively on

\* The Cabinet Mission's plan of May 16, 1946 (see V. P. Menon *The Transfer of Power in India*, p. 471 (18a) in devising a machinery for the election of a Constituent Assembly for B & C parts provinces took the absolute numbers of the population as its basis.

<sup>21</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 2. Italics mine.

\*\* Italics mine.

its border. States bordering on two of the three Sovereign States, each one a Federation, were to have option to join either of them.

1. *North-West India*—It included Sindh, Baluchistan, the North-West Frontier Province and the Punjab out of British India and the princely States of Qalat [Kalat], Khairpur, Bahawalpur, Kapurthala, Malerkotla, Faridkot, Nabha, Jhind, Simla Hill States, Patiala and Jammu-Kashmir. It could and should be called the Pakistan Federation. It would include "about 25 millions of Muslims" who would form "more than 60 per cent of the total population" of the Federation.<sup>24</sup>

2. *Bengal*, excluding the districts of Howrah, Midnapore, (Burdwan) and Darjeeling but including the Sylhet division of Assam and the Purnea district of Bihar. It would contain "more than 30 million Muslims" forming 57 per cent of the total population of the State, which was not to be a Federation.

3. *Hindustan* which comprehends the rest of British India with "two new autonomous provinces" formed in it, in addition, of course to those already existing and the various princely States excepting Hyderabad. It would have a population of 245 million, of whom Muslims being only about 23 millions would be "a minority of 10 per cent". The two new autonomous provinces to be formed are:

(a) Delhi Province which comprises Delhi, Meerut Division, Rohilkhand Division and the district of Aligarh. The Muslims in this province numbering only 3.5 million would form "about 28 per cent" of the total population;

(b) Malabar Province which comprises Malabar and "adjoining areas on the Malabar coasts". The implications of the last expression are not clear; but I take it that it subsumes not only South Canara but parts of Cochin and Travancore within it, thus securing the whole Moplah community and the Christians of the region who together would prevent Hindu (absolute and permanent) majority, though the Muslims numbering only "about 1.4 million" formed 27 per cent of the total population.

4. *Hyderabad* "with its dominions Berar and Karnatik" was to be the fourth Sovereign State.

With this scheme, which is more ambitious and quite outspoken, there would have been four Sovereign States carved out of India, British and Princely, three of which very strategically and conveniently placed and well provided with three ports, Karachi, Madras and Chittagong, and comprising almost 45 per cent of the total area of the country, would have been placed under Muslim sovereignty. Though this scheme gave away, Calcutta and apparently most of Assam, its inclusion of the Purnea district of Bihar within Muslim Bengal is noteworthy and purposeful. Lying as it

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

does athwart the small western border of Assam and Darjeeling district and stretching north upto Nepal border it could effectively bottle up both, and soon turn them into appendages of Muslim Bengal, to be turned later into its incorporated territories!

. With the three strategically well-placed Muslim Sovereign states, which could among themselves form a Federation of their own, the Hindus and Sikhs at least of the North-West and North-East parts of Pakistan Federation could be pressed out and if need be beaten out of them!

But then there would remain the question of about 25 million Muslims scattered over "Hindustan" and their possible fate. The learned professors, having more or less clearly foreseen it, have made three very "helpful" and far-reaching provisions. Two of them, in the form of the formation of two new provinces within "Hindustan", are already mentioned above. The third provision, much more far-sighted and penetrating, is this:

5. All towns of India with a population of 50,000 or more shall be Free Cities, which, whatever that may imply, is an expression we came across in the plan of Dr Latif in regard to Ajmir. I do not think that such towns in the whole of India at the date, when these Aligarh professors offered their solution to their co-religionists—for their scheme is quite openly and clearly addressed to the Muslims of India who must secure it for their co-religionists on the express advice and earnest appeal of these professors—such towns could have numbered less than hundred. As the authors have put this special and valuable (of course for their co-religionists) proposal after their sovereign state of "Hindustan", though they use the expression "towns of India" in it, we have to understand it to apply to towns of "Hindustan". In that case the number of towns with a population of 50,000 or more must be less than 100!

In asking the Muslims of "Hindustan" to have the specifically described towns as "free units", evidently because Muslims having tended to be largely a town population would be naturally in fair concentration in them, and the affairs being guaranteed to be locally managed, they manage to give "about 1.25 millions of Muslims" an effective voice, and enable them to keep well afloat and swimming merrily in the Hindu sea! In the words<sup>25</sup> of the authors of the scheme: "In Hindustan the Muslims largely live in cities and in considerable numbers. We cannot afford to leave them entirely at the mercy of the Hindu Government. Therefore, it is necessary to protect their interests. *Left to themselves they can fight their own battle in those towns.*" Not satisfied with only arranging for the present mere effectiveness they project into the future and exhort (?), or is it that they would compel by some kind of legislation (?), the scattered Muslims to congregate together in villages so as to be prepared for an effective role in the affairs of the village of to-day but the town of tomorrow units!

As there were to be four sovereign States, the authors of the scheme

<sup>25</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 6. Italics mine.



have naturally made further suggestions regarding "a defensive and offensive alliance" between three of them, leaving out Hyderabad, which, though it "will naturally become the southern wing of Muslim India", was "at least as sovereign as Nepal". We need not deal with these as our purpose is to scan the aspirations of the Muslims of India that were clearly formulated by their intellectuals and/or political leaders.

Even the very suave late Dr Rajendra Prasad could not help characterizing the principle of this wish-fulfilling scheme of the Aligarh professors as "heads you lose, tails we win" !

In March 1940, from the presidential chair of the Muslim League, Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah opened his broadside against the nationhood of India with the emphatic assertion of the Muslims being a distinct nation and of the impossibility of their accepting any constitution for India as a whole "which must necessarily result in a Hindu majority government". On 24 March the session of the Muslim League passed the famous resolution which became the guiding star of Muslim negotiations, political cogitations and activity till ultimately India was divided into two sovereign States of Pakistan and India (Bharat) on August 14 and 15 in 1947.

The resolution which was worded in the most general terms, without specification of the ideas, contained the kernel of the whole matter, i.e., the basic principle stated in it. It read: <sup>26</sup>

geographically contiguous units are [to be] demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with territorial readjustments as may be necessary that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority, as in the north-western and eastern zones of India, should be grouped to constitute "independent States" in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign...

Almost exactly 3 months after the passing of the resolution Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah in his interview with the Viceroy on 27 June 1940, among other things, "insisted that any declaration which His Majesty's Government might make should not preclude, when it came to the full-dress consideration of India's future constitution, a fair and unprejudiced hearing of the Muslim League proposal for the creation of two Indias." <sup>27</sup>

Seven months after this in February 1941 press reports divulged a scheme of partition of India and creation of Pakistan attributed to a sub-committee of the Muslim League, which had been asked to study the various proposals put up for the formation of Pakistan. According to it, there were to be two sovereign Muslim States: one, comprising the provinces of Sindh,

Baluchistan, the North-West Frontier Province and the Punjab *with the addition of Delhi province*, and the other comprising Bengal and Assam. It was assumed in the plan that the integrity of Hyderabad and of the States of Muslim rulers would be recognized and remain intact.<sup>28</sup>

The report was, however, repudiated by Jinnah.

The next spot of light on the development of Pakistan idea is shed by Chakravarti Rajagopalachari's activity in the beginning of 1943. Having drawn up a formula calculated, in his opinion, to meet the Muslim League demand, he consulted Mahatma Gandhi about it and obtained his approval in February.\* Communicating the same to Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah in April 1944—why he waited so long or what happened in between about it, whether it remained secret etc. there is no indication in the three or four authoritative sourcebooks, I have used—Rajagopalachari published it on 10 July 1944. The portion relevant to the Muslim League resolution and demand read:

After the termination of the war, a commission shall be appointed for demarcating contiguous *districts* in the north-west and east of India, wherein the Muslim population is in absolute majority. In the areas thus demarcated, a plebiscite of all the inhabitants held on the basis of adult suffrage or other practicable franchise shall ultimately decide the issue of separation from Hindustan. If the majority decide in favour of forming a sovereign State separate from Hindustan, such decision shall be given effect to, without prejudice to the right of districts on the border to choose to join either state... In the event of separation, mutual agreements shall be entered into for safeguarding defence, commerce and communications and for other essential purposes. Any transfer of population shall only be on an absolutely voluntary basis.

V. P. Menon assures us—he puts the expression in inverted commas but does not refer to any document—that Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah “dismissed the Rajagopalachari formula as offering ‘shadow and a husk, a maimed, mutilated and moth-eaten Pakistan’”.

Mahatma Gandhi went a step or two further in getting the Muslim League idea of Pakistan concretized. In his letter of 21 September 1944 addressed to Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah,<sup>29</sup> he admitted that

the Muslims living in the North-West zones, i.e., Baluchistan, Sindh, North-West Frontier Province and that part of the Punjab where they

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 103. Italics mine.

\* Philips, *op. cit.*, pp. 355-6 puts this event down as in March, quoting the actual words of the letter written by Rajagopalachari, reproducing it from *Indian Annual Register* (1944), pp. 129-30, V. P. Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. 162-3. Italics mine.

<sup>29</sup> V. P. Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-5; Philips, *op. cit.*, pp. 356-7. Italics mine.

are in absolute majority over all the other elements and in parts of Bengal and Assam where they are in absolute majority, desire to live in separation from the rest of India.

He further repeated what is already given in Rajagopalachari's communication regarding the time and procedure of deciding the wishes of the inhabitants and the territorial demarcation. He added about separation and post-separation arrangements:

If the vote is in favour of separation it shall be agreed that these areas shall form a separate state as soon as possible after India is free from foreign domination and can therefore be constituted into two sovereign Independent States. There shall be a treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of *foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like*, which must continue to be matters of common interest between the contracting parties.

Jinnah's reply<sup>30</sup> to Gandhi dated 25 September 1944 is of historic importance. For it was for the first time that by implication,—which by its nature is almost equivalent to a direct statement—Jinnah translated the general terms of the Muslim League resolution of 1940 into specific territorial units. He said: "You [Gandhi] do not accept that Pakistan is composed of two zones, North-West and North-East, comprising six provinces, namely Sindh, Baluchistan, North-West Frontier Province, the Punjab, Bengal and Assam, subject to territorial adjustments that may be agreed upon, as indicated in the Lahore Resolution", and characterized Gandhi's offer as "the husk" and as "opposed to the Lahore Resolution—". He further pointed out that even in the "mutilated areas" demarcated according to Gandhi's offer "the right of self-determination will not be exercised by the Muslims but by inhabitants of these areas so demarcated", which, too, was opposed "to the fundamentals of the Lahore Resolution [the Muslim League resolution of 1940 mentioned above]".

In his talk to the Parliamentary Delegation of January 1946, Jinnah made it clear that Pakistan's idea must be accepted by all the parties concerned before any interim Government manned by Indians could be formed and that the drawing of the frontier between Pakistan and Hindustan could be a matter for negotiation between the two constitution-making bodies for Pakistan and Hindustan. He further added that "he did not envisage predominantly non-Muslim areas, like the Ambala Division of the Punjab, remaining in Pakistan, but instead that Pakistan must be a living State economically and culturally". He affirmed that relations with Hindustan would be purely diplomatic, none of the usual powers and functions of a sovereign

<sup>30</sup> Philips, pp. 357-60. Italics mine.

State being permitted to be in common with it.<sup>31</sup>

In the General Elections of December 1945, the Congress secured 91.3 per cent of the votes cast in the non-Muslim constituencies, while the Muslim League captured 86.6 per cent of the total votes cast in the Muslim constituencies.<sup>32</sup> Thus the difference in the relative strengths of the Congress and of the Muslim League among the voters of the respective sectional constituencies was very small. And it could be legitimately affirmed that whereas the Congress reflected the opinion of and represented the non-Muslim voters of the country, the Muslim League did the same for its Muslim voters. The solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem acceptable to the Muslims of India as a whole at the end of the year 1945, on the eve of the attainment of Indian independence, was thus that envisaged by the Muslim League which had by then assumed a more or less intelligible form.

The notable fact is that *all the seats reserved for Muslims in the Central Assembly were captured by the League, not a single so-called nationalist Muslim having been successful. In the Assemblies of four of the Provinces, Bombay, C.P. and Berar, Madras and Orissa, too, all the Muslim members were those elected on the Muslim League ticket. In the Bengal Assembly 96 per cent, and in that of Assam 91 per cent, of the Muslim members owed their seats to the Muslim League. In the Punjab, Bihar, U.P., and Sindh Assemblies the Muslim League muslim members were 88.6, 85, 82 and 80 per cent of the Muslim members of the respective Assemblies. Only in the North-West Frontier Province the non-Muslim Leaguers were in a majority among the Muslim members of its Assembly, the Leaguers being only 45 per cent of the total.*<sup>33</sup>

A few days after his interview with the Cabinet Mission, Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah, presiding over a convention of 500 or so legislators elected on the Muslim League ticket, which held its session in Delhi on the 10th and 11th of April 1946—this was the first of its kind, may it be noted, for we shall come across this pressure device revived and operated in Republican India later—had a lengthy resolution passed by it, evidently unanimously.

The relevant and important portion of the resolution for our purposes is that part which reiterated the demand for Pakistan. It read: "The zones comprising *Bengal* and *Assam* in the North-East and the *Punjab*, the North-West Frontier Province, *Sindh* and *Baluchistan* in the North-West of India, namely Pakistan zones where the Muslims are in a dominant majority be constituted into a sovereign independent State".

In his second interview with the Cabinet Mission on April 16 in the course of a long discussion, almost a debate, Jinnah asserted that "*even*

<sup>31</sup> V. P. Menon, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 226.

<sup>33</sup> Mehkri, *op. cit.*, p. 471, quoting from an official document.

<sup>34</sup> Mehkri, *op. cit.*, p. 474; V. P. Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. 246-7.

*if the whole of his claims were granted, the Congress got three-quarters of India. At worst, it would lose Calcutta, some part of Western Bengal (Burdwan) and Ambala Division.*" Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah ended his interview by stating that *"the more the Congress was encouraged to lop off parts of the Pakistan which he claimed, or to reduce its sovereignty, the less possibility would there be of an agreed settlement"*.<sup>15</sup>

The last stage in the development and presentation of the Muslim League viewpoint is represented in the memorandum issued by the League either on the 11 or 12 May 1946, which contained both offers and demands. One of them relevant to our discussion read: <sup>36</sup>

the Six Muslim provinces (*the Panjab, North-West Frontier Province, Baluchistan, Sindh, Bengal and Assam*) shall be grouped together as one group and will deal with all other subjects and matters except foreign affairs, defence and communications necessary for defence, which may be dealt with by the constitution-making bodies of the two groups of provinces—Muslim provinces (hereinafter named Pakistan group) and Hindu provinces—sitting together.

Another very important offer, —and this must be considered to be an offer only and no demand, for it was the first, and perhaps the last, time, that Jinnah and the Muslim League, since 1940, were prepared to think in terms of Union Government in which both Pakistan and Hindustan may join—read: *"There should be parity of representation between the two groups of provinces in the Union executive and the legislature, if any."*

It is seen that the sovereign Muslim State of Pakistan which Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah and the Muslim League aspired for was to comprise the whole of the six provinces of British India, viz. Sindh, Baluchistan, North-West Frontier Province, *the Panjab, Bengal and Assam*. It was thus to have not only Karachi and Chittagong as its ports but also the huge metropolitan conglomerate of Calcutta. At one time the League had even included *Delhi province within its Pakistani ambit* but somehow it had finally dropped it out!

The Union of Pakistan and Hindustan —mark that where possible the League resolutions and announcements on the subject referred to the rest of British India, and it was only British India without the Indian States that almost throughout figured in the discussions, declarations, and pronouncements on the new set-up of post-independence India, as either Hindu provinces or Hindustan but not as India—if any, would be possible only if Pakistan was given parity with Hindustan in the Executive of the Union, the same condition applying to the legislature if any. With the kind

<sup>15</sup> V. P. Menon, *ibid.*, 250-1. Italics mine.

<sup>36</sup> V. P. Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. 259-60.

N.B.: Italics mine.

of experience, which the great leaders of the Congress had in their co-operative, or rather coexistential venture with the Muslim Leaguers during the brief and breezy life of the interim Government with the Viceroy at the head of it, it was impossible that the non-Muslim portion of India, India (Blharat), should look at the idea of any proposal of that sort. The matter ended there but for the fond hopes of some incurable optimists or wishful thinkers!

The aspirations of intellectuals like Dr Latif of Hyderabad or Professors Hasan and Qadri of Aligarh, whose viewpoints are those of the Muslim Leaguers of the time, as we have seen, were very much more soaring, ambitious, and poisonous for the non-Muslim sovereign State or States Federation that was to remain of India after satisfying them.

I shall now briefly summarize in fundamentals a plan for the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem put up by a very responsible and highly placed Muslim intellectual-cum-practical statesman, who must be described as, though not one of the so-called nationalist Muslims, not a Muslim Leaguer either (?).

Sir Syed Sultan Ahmad, who wrote on Islam, rose to be a member of the Viceroy's Council and then was an adviser to the Princes' Chamber, put up his plan for solving the Hindu-Muslim problem within the framework of an Indian whole. He wrote when other plans were already almost old, and almost on the eve of the surrender of Germany. He published his brochure entitled *A Treaty between India and the United Kingdom*, in December 1914, under the auspices of the Institute of International Affairs, New Delhi.

The bulk of the brochure, nearly four-fifths, is taken up by very ordinary matter about Sir Stafford Cripps' offer, Tribal and Frontier Territories, Defence, Neighbours, near and distant, Russia, America and the British Commonwealth. Only about one-fifth, i.e., the last 23 pages, is devoted to the statement of an agreed Constitution which gives his plan about British India and the Indian States and also the intermediate declarations.

Sir Syed Sultan Ahmed begins by pointing out that "though the ideology of Pakistan based on the principle of self-determination is definite enough, its geography is not yet so definite." He raises a number of posers which must militate against the acceptance of the Pakistan plan. These clearly show that Sir Syed was not satisfied with the idea, partially, at least, because he was not sure, or shall I say certain, as he would have liked to be (?), about either *Amritsar or Calcutta being included in Pakistan*. He had tribulations regarding *North-West Frontier Province opting out of Pakistan, a situation which could nullify in practice the whole ideological plan of Pakistan*. He was further perturbed over the situation that *Pakistan of the Muslim League would create problems for the Muslims that would remain in non-Pakistani India*. Evidently he was satisfied that they could not get any weightage, as he points out the loss of advantage in the British Government's Com-

munal Award enjoyed under the Act of 1935. "The faint suggestion that the Muslims in the rest of India will be able to migrate to Pakistan is too fantastic" to deserve a serious discussion. Further, Pakistan would not be economically viable. The two Pakistans, "the North-West and the North-East, will be separated by Hindustan stretching 700 miles between them. *There is no proposal for a corridor, if any, to link them up.* They will have no military security".<sup>37</sup> Finally he admonishes his co-religionists in the following biting words: "*Self-deception may be attractive upto a stage but may become disastrous and tragic if it is not called off in time.*"

Sir Syed, therefore, upholds a Federal State, the Union of India. The British Provinces may be readjusted, particularly those in the North-West and the North-East, so that in them the Muslim majority may be substantially increased. He thinks of the Provinces with the above-mentioned modification as the units which by their federation form the Union, except that the adjusted Provinces of the North-West and the North-East, being grouped in each, shall be treated as two units. The units are to be autonomous and sovereign in all internal affairs; and their "*external freedom will be subject only to the powers transferred to the Union by common agreement between the units*". The Centre, i.e., the Union Government was to "have powers and authority" over (1) Defence, (2) Foreign relations, (3) Currency, (4) Customs, (5) Broadcasting, (6) Airways, (7) Railways, (8) Shipping and (9) Posts and Telegraphs.

The Muslims were to have equal representation with Caste-Hindus, i.e., 40 per cent of the total each, the remaining 20 per cent being equally divided between the Scheduled Castes or Depressed Classes, on the one hand, and the Indian Christians, Anglo-Indians, Sikhs, Parsees, Tribes, etc. on the other. The Cabinet, the Executive Government, was to be formed on the same basis of communal ratios, the Muslims having parity with Caste-Hindus. Further, the Prime Minister was to be alternately a Muslim and a non-Muslim, the office of the Deputy Prime Minister being adjusted between the two groups, Muslims and Hindus—here non-Muslim is replaced by Hindu and I do not know that it is not a slip. So also the two positions, the Defence Minister and the Commander-in-Chief, were to be adjusted to the same formula, *so that at any time either the Commander-in-Chief or the Defence Minister was to be a Muslim.* The office was not confined to the Hindus but was to be open to all non-Muslims. The Army-Services, the fighting forces were to consist of 50 per cent Muslims and 50 per cent non-Muslims, i.e., Hindus and all others. The ratio was to be "reflected" "as far as possible and subject to efficiency"—efficiency for Army purposes was evidently thought by Sir Syed as a natural endowment of the Muslims or in the alternative that it did not matter!—in the civil services.

<sup>37</sup> *Op cit.*, p. 88.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86.

Not satisfied with absolute parity for his co-religionists with the rest of the Indians as a group, Sir Syed with the lubricating self-justifying dictum "more than equality can neither be asked nor given", makes the self-contradictory proposal that "an equality in the Centre would [should?] be managed by giving an absolute 51 per cent majority alternately to the Hindu and the Muslim".<sup>39</sup>

The Indian States are not left out by this solver of the Hindu-Muslim problem unlike the Muslim League and Jinnah. They were to be formed into five blocks "with minor boundary alternations [alterations] if necessary" as: (1) Kashmir and the Punjab States; (2) Kathiawar [Saurashtra] and Rajputana States; (3) Central India and Eastern States; (4) Mysore, Travancore and Cochin and (5) Hyderabad.<sup>40</sup> They were to be part and parcel of the Federation, the Union of India, but whether as blocks or as single component States it is not clear. Nor is there any provision for their representation in the Federal Assembly. Evidently Sir Syed was too much in a hurry and too little bothered about the Indian States and their details, except for the integrity and status of Hyderabad State, to wait to answer such questions! His purpose was capitally achieved if he could secure absolute parity in all legislative, administrative, and executive offices, and provide for a strong Muslim army as a part of the Indian army at the cost of the general public, with the conjuring summons, "To the Hindu, too, our plan ought to make an appeal for this reason that while his major community is called upon to make some sacrifice it is not sacrificed." It would have been nice of Sir Syed if he had added that the operation of sacrifice was reserved for the next generation in all kindness!

It is clear from the brief statement of the four plans put up by Muslim intellectuals and/or responsible Muslim leaders high up in the political, administrative and social world of India of the 15 years-period 1930 to 1945, immediately preceding the arrival of the "historic" Cabinet Mission of the post-War Labour Government of Great Britain, that the aspirations of the Muslims of then India were high-soaring and widely encompassing. They envisaged the securing of about 45 per cent of the total area of the country for the less than 24 per cent of the total population formed by the Muslims of the country, or in the alternative complete parity and reservation in all offices and posts on that basis for them with the more than 75 per cent of the total population formed by the non-Muslims of India, including Caste-Hindus, Scheduled Caste Hindus, Sikhs, Christians, Anglo-Indians, Parsis and the tribal people. In the offing of, at least three of these Muslim exponents, was the notion of the Muslims being a distinct nation and also the provision, though not quite overtly mentioned, for a separate Pakistani sovereign State, composed of not only two Muslim States placed

<sup>39</sup> By Hindu Sir Syed Sultan Ahmad must have meant the non-Muslim Indians including Hindus.

<sup>40</sup> Sir Syed forgot Baroda and Kolhapur and the other Deccan States.



strategically in the north-west and the north-east but also of a third Muslim State, bigger than the one on the north-east and more prestigious and powerful than it and the other one of the north-west, very strategically placed in the midst of the southern area.

The north-western State was so designed that sooner or later it could stretch from beyond west of Rawalpindi to beyond east of Delhi-Agra, as far as Lucknow. The north-east State, and the southern Hyderabad Muslim State together would have brought to the Pakistani Federation four good ports, Karachi, Madras, Calcutta and Chittagong, and the great cities of Calcutta, Madras, Delhi, Karachi, Lahore, Amritsar, Agra, Kanpur (Cawnpore), Lucknow and Hyderabad. And other cities of the north-east including beautiful Shillong, almost rivalling Srinagar of Kashmir, could have been engulfed within Pakistan a little later.

Such were the vast and ambitious aspirations and expectations of the vast majority of the Muslims of India, whether they voted for the Muslim League or not, with the exception, at least vocally and overtly, of the very small group of Muslims who stood by the Congress and were then known as the Nationalist Muslims!

Compared with these schemes the plan of the Muslim League and Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah was more modest and more reasonable, though more outspoken, at least as it emerged at the end of the year 1944. It has, however, to be remembered that the League and Jinnah were inscrutably and complacently confident about the Indian States, which they had almost wholly refrained from mentioning, keeping themselves separate and intact, giving the Muslims a number of rallying centres conveniently dotted over the whole of India from Khairpur to Bhopal, from Rampur to Junagadh and down south to Hyderabad and west to Janjira on the Bombay coast. Even that plan, however, included in it what is to-day East Punjab of India (Bharat) and a large portion, including Calcutta, of what is to-day West-Bengal, and the whole of Assam!

In all the plans and in all expectations the giant Muslim State of Hyderabad with Urdu as its official language, though not even 12 per cent of the population used it as their routine language, was conceived of as intact and a charmed centre of Muslim concentration and future resurgence, whether its future was specifically mentioned or not. The book of the ex-Prime Minister of Hyderabad, Mir Liaq Ali, ostensibly narrating the events that resulted in the liquidation of the State as an independent entity, evinces the extent and depth of the pangs felt by the Muslims at the event. On the background of these hopes, desires and expectations, the proposal of the States Reorganization Commission,—a three-man committee, of which Saiyid Fazl Ali, a prominent Congress Muslim, was the Chairman, appointed three years after the death of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, the liquidator of Hyderabad,—that Hyderabad should continue as a separate unit State, acquires significance! The reasoning put forward in support by the Con-

mission makes amusing reading! The final outcome in the form of its being merged in the Andhra Pradesh State must have immensely sharpened the poignancy of the frustration felt by Muslims!

Before making a brief comparison between what the Muslim aspirations and expectations were in 1944 regarding their share of the division of the heritage of India and the portion they actually received as the result of the award of Earl Attlee and Lord Mountbatten, it is necessary to make an attempt to gauge the aspirations and expectations of the nationalist Muslims, who were with the Congress, leaving out the Muslims of the North-West Frontier Province. The prince among these nationalist Muslims, the late Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, has obliged us by his ideas and plan. And I shall now turn to a presentation of the same.

At the outset I am sorry to note that there is a discrepancy about certain dates, given by Azad in his autobiographical narrative entitled *India Wins Freedom*, published posthumously in 1959, and those given by Mr V. P. Menon in his *The Transfer of Power in India* (1957).

I shall begin with Menon's statement both because he puts it down as coming from Azad earlier than Azad himself does in his book and also because it is fuller than the latter. In both accounts, however, Azad's ideas and plan appear as having been expressed only after all the plans of the Muslims and the finalization of the Muslim League plan by it in its resolution of December 1944 had been out.

According to Menon,<sup>41</sup> Nationalist Muslims were finding themselves in a difficult position *vis-a-vis* the League for some time, and that it was towards the end of August 1945, that Azad approached Mahatma Gandhi with his 'plan for a communal settlement'. He argued that unless the Muslim fears [of Hindu domination] were removed by "a scheme under which they would feel secure" any attempt at "a unitary government at the Centre would fail". While "*he as an Indian Muslim regarded partition as a defeatist policy and could not accept it*", he also thought *partition to be against the interest of the Muslims themselves*.

Azad's plan summarized from its statement by Mr V. P. Menon was:

1. India was to be a federation of "fully autonomous" units.
2. The federal or Central subjects must be only those that are of an all-India nature and are agreed upon by the constituent units.
3. The constituent units were to have the right of secession.
4. The electorates both Central and Provincial were to be joint and not separate for any group or community.
5. The franchise, however, was to be so differential as to secure in the electorates enfranchised persons corresponding to the strength of

<sup>41</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 221-2. *Italics mine.*

- the population of the communities [Muslims and Hindus or all is not stated].
6. Yet in the Central legislature there was to be parity between Hindus and Muslims, i.e., the Muslims who formed only about one-third as many as the Hindus were to have as many seats in the Central legislature as the Hindus.
  7. *In the Central Executive, too, the Muslim members were to be equal in number with the Hindu ones.*
  8. The last arrangement was to be in operation "*till such time as communal suspicion disappeared and parties were formed on economic and political lines*".
  9. By a convention "*the head of the Indian federation [the President in the present set up?]*" should, "*in the initial period [not specified in terms either of years or of situations], be Hindu and Muslim by turn*".

Mr Menon<sup>42</sup> assures his readers that what consideration the Congress Working Committee gave to Azad's proposal is not known. The resolution on the subject passed by it at its meeting in September 1945, the "rider" of which is quoted by him in full, was evidently too general to be considered as recording any opinion on the specific provisions of Azad's plan detailed above.

Azad's<sup>43</sup> own account of his life since the imprisonment of all the Congress leaders till 15 August 1947, makes it quite clear that he was released from prison on 15 June 1945, and that after attending the meeting of the Congress Working Committee called by him at Bombay on 21 June and another on 24th at Delhi in Mahatma Gandhi's temporary residence, he went to the Viceroy's Round Table Conference at Simla on 25 June, and then proceeded to Kashmir where he remained convalescing in Gulnarg till 9 September 1945. He came to Delhi in an American Army plane on the 10th and proceeded to Poona, where he attended and presided over the Working Committee meeting on 14 September 1945. Azad could have discussed whatever plan, if any, he had formulated then, with Mahatma Gandhi only either in June or in September but not in August 1945. And Azad who quotes relevant resolutions of the Congress Working Committee<sup>44</sup> does not mention his having any definite plan for the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem much less does he state that he discussed it either with Mahatma Gandhi or the Working Committee.

Azad,<sup>45</sup> on the other hand, informs his readers of his views on the Hindu-Muslim problem in the context of the success and failure of the

<sup>42</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 222.

<sup>43</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 89-205. See particularly pp. 99, 103, 104, 107, 118-9, 124.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>45</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 138-140, 142-45.

Congress in the General Election of December 1945 and in connection with the negotiations started by the Cabinet Mission, which according to Menon<sup>46</sup> arrived in New Delhi on 24 March 1946, but according to Azad<sup>47</sup> on 23 March.

About the conception of his plan for the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem, Azad's<sup>48</sup> own version is that the Simla Conference of 25 and 26 June 1945 "had convinced" him that, though "the political issue" was over, "the communal differences were still unresolved". He records his views on it and their genesis thus:

1. *"As a community, the Muslims were extremely anxious about their future. It is true that they were in a clear majority in certain provinces. At the provincial level they had no fears in these areas. They were however a minority in India as a whole and were troubled by the fear that their position and status in independent India would not be secure";*
2. He "gave continuous and anxious thought to this subject";
3. India, being *"a vast country with a large population divided into more or less homogeneous units which live in different provinces"*, is unsuited for a unitary government but requires a constitution assuring "to the provinces largest measure of autonomy". This can be provided by dividing the powers and functions into two groups:
  - (a) those that must be given over to the Centre, and
  - (b) those from among which only those specifically made over by a province or provinces to the Centre can belong to it.

The former, which must be the three subjects, functions, or powers of Defence, Communications and Foreign Affairs, were to be called the "compulsory subjects" and the latter the "optional ones".

Here I should note, for the attention of the reader and in explanation of my attitude towards Maulana Azad's statements on the matter of his plan for the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem, that I find that Azad's memory was clearly defective for dates. He mentions on pages 99 and 101 that Lord Wavell went to London for discussions with the British Cabinet in May 1945; Menon whose testimony on this matter cannot but be consider-

<sup>46</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 236.

<sup>47</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 139-41, 142-45. Italics are mine and are intended to draw attention to close similarities between the ideas and expressions thus treated and those of the Aligarh Professors' plan, of Dr Latif's Alternative Constitution, and of Sir Syed Sultan Ahmad's scheme, the similarities being so close as fit to be called reminiscences or repetitions.

ed to be incontestible, clearly states (p. 181) that Wavell reached London on 23 March and returned to Delhi on 4 June. Azad says (p. 141) that he met the Cabinet Mission for the first time on 6 April 1946 but Menon (*op. cit.*, p. 237) says that "the Congress case was presented on 3rd April by Abul Kalam Azad".

Azad says further (p. 141) that it was some days after he met the Cabinet Mission and put his plan before it and was complimented upon by its members for "in fact suggesting a new solution of the communal problem"—readers should remember that even Dr Latif, the Hyderabad intellectual solving the Hindu-Muslim problem through an "alternative constitution" had assigned (*op. cit.*, p. 40) to the Central Government, the Federal one, over and above defence, foreign affairs and communications not only commerce but also "like" matters—that he reported to his Congress colleagues his plan and that too, "in somewhat greater detail", when he met them in the Working Committee on 12 April 1946. He adds that Mahatma Gandhi supported him against Vallabhbhai Patel's and some other members' criticism of it. He says that ultimately he issued a statement on 15 April 1946 "to place it before the country".

The statement of 15 April which Azad issued is happily for us reproduced in his autobiographical account on pages 142 to 145. Having read it through and through half a dozen times I confidently assert that it contains hardly anything either of the plan which, on his affirmation was first put up before the Cabinet Mission, or which Menon unequivocally asserts as having been put before Mahatma Gandhi by Azad sometime in August 1945. Rather it is an impassioned plea addressed to Azad's co-religionists to dissuade them from the *Pakistan idea of the Muslim League*, which in *Azad's counting was nothing short of defeatism, smacking of cowardice, and leading to their suicide*. There is hardly anything in it which has a reference to or a bearing on the welfare of India as a whole. In assuring his co-religionists on the positive side he asserts that he "*succeeded in making the Congress accept*" a formula which "*secures whatever merit the Pakistan scheme contains while all its defects and drawbacks are avoided*".\* It is in this assurance that he mentions the two items of his plan, i.e., full provincial autonomy with residuary powers vested in the provinces; and the compulsory and optional list of Central subjects, the former being a very short one.

As regards Azad's assertion that the Congress was persuaded to accept "his formula"—mark that he does not state that it was the whole plan which he had got accepted—and once again asserts the Congress acceptance of his scheme (*op. cit.*, page 150) in the context of the discussion of the Cabinet Mission plan of 16 May 1946, by the Working Committee of the Congress, dates not given. As yet he has not quoted any resolution of

\* Italics mine.

the Working Committee which testifies to the assertion. He has told us (p. 141) that he had discussed it with its members on 12 April but has not affirmed that it was accepted by it in a specific resolution. But V. P. Menon, who states that Azad had discussed his plan more than seven months earlier with Mahatma Gandhi, says,<sup>49</sup> in the context of Azad's interview with the Cabinet Mission to represent the Congress:

Regarding the future constitution, what the Congress had in mind was a federal government with a limited number of compulsory federal subjects such as defence, communications and foreign affairs and autonomous provinces in which would vest the residuary powers.

Further there would be a lot of optional subjects in respect of which it was to be the choice of a province to be federated or not. But he, too, does not specify the date or the exact text of the resolution of a Congress body, if any.

V. P. Menon<sup>50</sup> informs us further that Maulana Azad had another interview with the Cabinet Mission on 17 April at which Azad is said to have "agreed that the compulsory list should include foreign affairs and defence", thus contracting the compulsory list of Central subjects further from three to two!

The Cabinet Mission, before releasing its plan for the new set-up in India on 16 May 1946, had circulated to the Muslim League and the Congress a statement purporting to be points commonly agreeable to both of them. On the 12th of May 1946, in the memorandum submitted by the Congress among the twenty or so points raised by it, figures<sup>51</sup> the following:

The Constituent Assembly shall draw up a constitution for the Federal Union. *This shall consist of an All-India Federal Government and Legislature dealing with foreign affairs, defence, communications, fundamental rights, currency, customs and planning, as well as such other subjects as, on clear scrutiny, may be found to be intimately allied to them. The Federal Union will have necessary powers to obtain for itself the finances it requires for these subjects and the power to raise revenues in its own right. The Union must also have power to take remedial action in cases of breakdown of the constitution and in grave public emergencies.*

<sup>49</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 237-8.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 252.

<sup>51</sup> V. P. Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. 260-1. Italics are mine and are intended to draw the reader's pointed attention to the utter discrepancy in Azad's own account of the Congress attitude and resolutions on the subject revealed by him on pages 150, 151, 153 and 154, in which there is no reference to this memorandum, and also to impress upon the reader the unauthorized and contrary nature of Azad's own plan on the subject.

The Cabinet Mission released its plan for the new set-up in the form of a statement, which will be referred to as the Cabinet Mission Plan, on 16 May 1946. Azad says <sup>52</sup> that "basically" it is "the same as the one sketched in my statement of 15 April". Further he exhorts his readers to compare the two and that in order to make such a comparison easy he had appended the Cabinet Mission Plan to his book. I do not, however, find that in the appendices of Maulana Azad's autobiography. The only statement of any date after 1942 figuring in the Appendix of his book is "British Government's Statement of 3 June 1947." The Cabinet Mission Plan as the Statement of the Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy, 16 May 1946, is reproduced by V. P. Menon in extenso in Appendix IV of his book under reference. The main bulk of it, though not the complete whole, is reproduced by Philips in his book (pp. 378-82).

Azad states categorically that "after protracted negotiations [?], the Working Committee [of the Congress] in its resolution of 26 June accepted the Cabinet Mission's Plan for the future, though it found itself unable to accept the proposal for an interim Government," and goes on to remark: "The acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan by both Congress and Muslim League was a glorious event in the history of the freedom movement in India." He further tells us that the Working Committee met again a day previous to the meeting of the All India Congress Committee scheduled for 7 July in Bombay and that the latter body put its "seal of approval on the Working Committee's resolution",<sup>53</sup> Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the new Congress President in place of Azad, presiding.

Azad, quite inscrutably, has omitted the discussions and resolutions of the Congress Working Committee and a statement or statements that it issued to the public or submitted to Cabinet Mission. That there were more statements and/or decisions than one in the interval of about six weeks that elapsed between 16 May and 26 June is clear from V. P. Menon's account and to some extent from the documents reproduced in Philip's book referred to above. And what is more the resolution passed by the Working Committee on 24 May, which according to Menon<sup>54</sup> was done "after much deliberation", raised, according to him, "various points in regard to the Statement" of the Cabinet Mission, i.e., its Plan. And Philips<sup>55</sup> has obliged us by reproducing it almost in extenso, further mentioning its official document specification in the footnote as Cmd. 6835.

I shall quote here only three sentences from that resolution of the Working Committee which bear directly on the assertions and plan of Maulana Azad detailed above.

<sup>52</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 147, 149.

<sup>53</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 151, 153-4.

<sup>54</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 269.

<sup>55</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 382-4.

(1) "These objectives are: independence for India, a strong, though limited, central authority, full autonomy for the provinces, the establishment of a democratic structure in the centre and in the units, *the guarantee of the fundamental rights of individuals*\*. . ."

(2) In the view of the Committee "it will be open to the Constituent Assembly itself at any stage to make changes and variations, with the proviso that in regard to certain major communal matters a majority decision of both the major communities will be necessary . . ."

(3) "Thus the Constituent Assembly must be considered as a sovereign body with final authority for the purpose of drawing up a constitution and giving effect to it."

And now we must know the particular resolution of the Working Committee which Azad mentions as the one by which the Committee accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan and which was passed on 25 June 1946. Philips has reproduced it on pages 386 and 387 of his book and has given in the footnote its official document specification as Cmd. 6861.

I shall quote only two relevant sentences from the resolution: "The limitation of the Central authority [its power extending only to the three subjects which was the major plank of Azad's plan and one more, viz., fundamental rights], as contained in the proposals . . . weakened the whole structure and was unfair to some Provinces . . . there was sufficient scope for enlarging and strengthening the Central authority . . ."

From these three resolutions and statements of the Working Committee of the Congress it is clear that the Central or Federal Government of the truncated and restricted authority, which the Cabinet Mission was thinking of and which on Azad's own declaration was in the main Azad's own plan, was never acceptable to the Congress. It was Azad's own solution which, as one can see, by comparison with the plans of non-Nationalist Muslims summarized above, was even more favourable to the Muslims than that of Dr Latif in his "Alternative Constitution".

There is a still more serious point to be noted. And that is this. Maulana Azad formulated a plan even more favourable to the Muslims, one which was only a little less ambitious and advantageous than that of Sir Syed Sultan Ahmed, which he has not divulged in his autobiographical account. And this plan, as Menon<sup>56</sup> who has given us a glimpse of it tells us, Maulana Azad had got approved by Mahatma Gandhi. Whether Azad actually put it before the Cabinet Mission or not we do not know. Nor do we know that some Congress Muslims with Muslim League loyalty or sympathy did not have knowledge of it. According to that plan, as the summary presented above shows, the Muslims were to have parity in both the Central Executive and the Legislature. To keep the outward husk of unity Azad

\* Italics mine.

<sup>56</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 237-38, 260-61.



was prepared to sacrifice all justice and hand over the future of the majority of the Indians and of India to his co-religionists!

The above data and discussion are a clear testimony to the extravagant expectations and aspirations regarding their share in the political set-up of India, whether divided or undivided, not only of the Muslim Leaguers, who formed about 90 per cent of the total Muslims of India, but also of the ten per cent or so of them who were known as Nationalist Muslims.

Even a cursory comparison of the Muslim aspirations and expectations of the Muslims of India between 1938 and 1946 revealed in the plans of Dr Latif, of Professors Hasan and Qadri, of "a Punjabi", of Sir Syed Sultan Ahmed or even of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, with what they actually got in the final award of Earl Attlee and Lord Mountbatten will convince anyone that the actual achievement fell very much short of the expectation. Such a situation commonly creates frustration. And frustration is seen writ large in the behaviour of Pakistan during the last 20 years, as well as in the sayings and doings of the Muslim Indians during the last 15 years, and in bolder relief in the events that have occurred in the Muslim University of Aligarh during the same period, briefly narrated in another chapter.

In this connection if I mention the point about a corridor between West Pakistan and East Pakistan and the situation that has developed in Assam, it will suffice to highlight the feelings of Pakistani Muslims vis-a-vis their acquisition. Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah was reported to have said in his interview with a representative of the British Broadcasting Corporation in 1946: "The Hindus must not be allowed to put difficulties in the way of a State that wants to be their neighbour in a friendly way. *They must not be allowed to close the doors of communication between the Muslims of North-West India and the Muslims of North-East*".<sup>51</sup> The award of Earl Attlee and Lord Mountbatten did not give that corridor, nor have Jinnah's Hindus given it so far. May we not look upon Pakistan's pact with China and war on and/or war-like behaviour towards India (Bharat) during the last few years as acts dictated by the feeling of frustration and engendered by the hope of coercion of India into conceding a corridor?

The newsservice of the *Times of India* reporting from Delhi (*Times of India*, 22-4-1965) in the fourth week of April 1965, almost surprised the world with its revelation that the executive committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party was dissatisfied with Assam Government for not having taken adequate measures against Pakistani infiltration and infiltrants. The result as it pointed out was that Nowgong district and the sub-divisions of Barpatta, Goalpara and Dhubri had already become Muslim majority areas. It further asked the Government to "read the writing on the wall"

<sup>51</sup> Rajendra Prasad, *op. cit.*, p. 394. Italics mine. Did Jinnah harbour the idea of squeezing out the Hindus from his Pakistan that he should have spoken, if he is correctly reported, of Muslims and not of Muslim State?

and "not take this development lightly". The persistent and systematic endeavour of infiltration, in which process Muslims in Assam must have co-operated, for otherwise it could not have been so silently and successfully carried out as to raise a very emphatic protest from a Congress body against a Congress Government so publicly, is a testimony to Pakistani Muslims and, to some extent at least to Muslims in Assam having felt the sense of chagrin and frustration!

The frustration of the Muslim Leaguers of pre-1947 India, and leaving out the North-West Frontier Province they could not form less than 90 per cent of the Muslims of the rest of India, whether they are today Pakistanis or Muslim Indians, can be inferred and admitted as validly inferred, from the extent of the territories their intellectuals claimed and those they have actually got. The Aligarh professors and the Hyderabad ex-professor, all of whom I presume are to-day in India, who put forward the most extravagant claims on Indian territory, must be feeling not only frustration but also chagrin. So must all those Muslims in India who looked upto them and all Pakistani ones be in the same state of mind.

Pakistan of theirs did not get Assam and West Bengal and Calcutta. Moreover they had to give up not only the coveted Delhi province but also "their own and sure patrimony" in East Punjab!

Khaliquzzaman Choudhry,<sup>58</sup> later a front rank leader of Pakistan Muslims, wrote to Shaheed Suhrawardy, another notable worthily, on 10 September 1947:

We are now all thinking very hard as to what should be the position of minorities, particularly of the minority Muslims, in the Hindu-majority provinces. *We had not thought about it earlier, as we did not expect Bengal to be partitioned and Muslims being reduced to a minority in any part of Bengal. . . The good feeling between Hindus and Muslims at present existing here, and let us hope that this will be permanent, is largely due to the whole-hearted acceptance of the Indian Union flag by the Muslims and their adoption of the cry of Jai Hind . . .*

He advised Muslims in India further, *in order to prevent their complete subservience and submergence, that they should form themselves into strong pockets.* He opined: "It is politically desirable as well as necessary for survival and also culturally desirable."

That the above-mentioned situation by itself was sufficient to create feelings of chagrin and frustration comes out almost crystal clear in the considered utterances of Abul Kalam Azad pronounced by him in his statement of 15 April 1946 and 11 years thereafter, when the new political set-up was ten years old, in 1957. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's<sup>59</sup> utterance

<sup>58</sup> Khaliquzzaman Choudhry, *Pathway to Pakistan*, 1961, p. 397. Italics mine.

<sup>59</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 142. Italics mine.

in 1957 reads:

Accordingly on 15 April 1946, I issued a statement dealing with the demands of Muslims and other minorities. Now that the division of India is a fact and ten years have passed, I again look at the statement and find *that everything I had then said has come about.*

And what did Azad say in his statement of April 1946? It is this:

(1) The Muslim League scheme of Pakistan—I cannot but emphasize again the fact that the actual achievement of the League falls very much short of its “scheme” on the basis of which Azad made his observations—examined by him “as a Muslim” for “its likely effects upon the fortunes of *Muslims of India*” was found by him to be harmful to them and “in fact” creating “more problems than it solves”.

(2) The very term Pakistan he said, implying “a division of territories into pure and impure is *un-Islamic and a repudiation of the very spirit of Islam*”.

(3) “. . . *the scheme of Pakistan is a symbol of defeatism. . . It is a confession that Muslims cannot hold their own in India as a whole*”.

(4) “Over 90 millions in number they [Muslims] *are in quantity and quality a sufficiently important element in Indian life to influence decisively all questions of administration policy*”.

(5) “To me it seems *a pure sign of cowardice to give up my patrimony and content myself with a mere fragment of it*”.

(6) “In the Hindustan State there will remain 3½ crores [35 millions] \* of Muslims *scattered in small minorities all over the land. With 17 per cent in U.P., 12 per cent in Bihar and 9 per cent in Madras they will be weaker than they are to-day in the Hindu majority provinces. They have had their homelands in these regions for almost a thousand years and built up well-known centres of Muslim culture and civilization there.*” “*They will awaken overnight and discover that they have become aliens and foreigners. Backward industrially, educationally and economically, they will be left to the mercies to [of] what would then become an unadulterated Hindu ‘raj’*”.

(7) Within Pakistan even, the position of Muslims will be weak and vulnerable [?]. In no State of Pakistan “will their majority be comparable to the Hindu Majority in the Hindustan State”.\*\*

(8) When the emotional frenzy created by the propaganda of the Muslim League will have died down in the calm atmosphere of rational thinking “those who now support Pakistan will themselves repudiate it as harmful for Muslim interests”.

\* The Census of 1961 showed them to be nearly 4.6 crores or 46 millions!

\*\* That Azad writing in 1957 should have categorically stated that even this affirmative prophesy made in 1946 had come true provides some evidence that the so-

In the persistent endeavour of getting their personal law immune from any control by the Union Government without the previous approval of the Muslim community most of the Muslim members joined hands and those who did not do so kept quiet.<sup>64</sup>

Mohamed Ismail Sahib, of course, led by moving an appropriate amendment to Article 35 designed to get the personal law of the Muslims out of the State control; and not only B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur (Kerala) and Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur (Madras) but also Hussain Imam from Bihar and even Naziruddin Ahmad from Bengal supported him; and no Muslim came forward to oppose.

Once again,<sup>65</sup> while the Constituent Assembly was discussing on Article 13, Mohamed Ismail Sahib moved a similar but more positive amendment guaranteeing to persons the right "to follow the personal law of the group or community to which he belongs or professes to belong". Shri C. Subramaniam, the same honourable gentleman as the later Food Minister of the Union Government, pointed out that the Assembly had already passed an Article which lays down that "as far as possible personal law should come under a uniform civil code" under directive principles, suggesting that the amendment was, properly speaking, out of order. But Ismail Sahib promptly rejoined that he had made a similar proposal then and that he had wanted the question of personal law to be included under Fundamental Rights.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani (U.P. Muslim) supporting the amendment added:<sup>66</sup>

I say this regarding Muslims. There are *three fundamentals in their personal law, namely, religion, language and culture which have not been ordained by human agency*. . . If there is anyone, who thinks that he can interfere in the personal law of the Muslims, then, I would say to him that the result will be very harmful. . . . Musalmans will not submit to any interference in the personal law, and if anybody has got the courage to say so then I declare . . . /at this stage the Vice-President who was in the Chair called "Order, order"/. He should remain convinced—and I declare in the House—that Mussalmans will never submit to any interference in their personal law, and they will have to face an iron wall of Muslim determination to oppose them in every way.

Third time,<sup>67</sup> on the occasion of the consideration of Article 19, both Mohamed Ismail Sahib and B. Pocker Sahib jointly moved an amendment designed to exempt the personal law of a group from the purview of State

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 7, 1, pp. 540-52.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 7, 2, pp. 721-3, 785.

<sup>66</sup> *Constituent Assembly Debates*, 7, 2, pp. 758-60. Italics mine.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 7, 2, pp. 829-31, 839.

control which was defeated.

In regard to language, the Muslim members of the Constituent Assembly appear to have been frustrated even more widely and intensely. While Maulana Hasrat Mohani wanted the consideration of Article 23 regarding safeguards for minority enabling it to preserve and conserve its religion, language and script and culture, to be postponed till the relevant Article about the "official language" of India was considered and passed, Z. H. Lari moved more than one amendment. His amendment ran:<sup>68</sup> "Minorities in every unit shall be protected in respect of their language, script and culture, and no laws or regulations may be enacted that may operate oppressively or prejudicially in this respect." Speaking to it he pointed out that according to the reports of the Committee, First Series, 1947, the Committee on the Fundamental Rights (p. 30 of the report) had framed the clause under discussion thus: "Minorities in every unit shall be protected in respect of their language, script and culture, and no laws or regulations may be enacted that may operate oppressively or prejudicially in this respect" and that it was approved by the Constituent Assembly in April 1947.

The Article was being considered, however, on 7 December 1948, i.e., more than one year and three months after the partition of the country had been effected by the Muslims who had thought of themselves as a nation different from the Hindus and not as one nation of India along with them. And Lari wanted the words "any section of the citizens" in the proposal substituted by the word "minority" and the further guarantee to fortify the right of the minority against any possible modification through State control. Maulana Hasrat Mohani supported him. Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant in his speech made remarks which testify to the source of such amendments and substantiates the thesis about Muslim frustration put forward here. Observed Pant:<sup>69</sup> ". . . *the ghost of 'two nations' seems to be lingering somewhere, even within the precincts of this very august Chamber.* Otherwise, I think, such a bogey would not have been raised here." The amendment was negatived without a division which was not granted even when Pandit Kunzru requested that the number of those favouring the amendment may be counted by a show of hands.<sup>70</sup>

When later the Article specifying Hindi in Devnagri script as the Official Language of India came up for consideration, though Bengali Muslim, Naziruddin Ahmad made a proposal for Sanskrit replacing Hindi, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad evidently wanted Hindustani. And though he did not move any amendment, his speech clearly demonstrated his utter irritation at Hindi in Devanagari script being adopted as the official language.<sup>71</sup>

Mohamed Hifzur Rahman of U.P., later one of the leading organizers

<sup>68</sup> *Constituent Assembly Debates*, 7, 2, pp. 892-3, 917.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid*, p. 915. Italics mine.

<sup>70</sup> *Constituent Assembly Debates*, 7, 2, pp. 926-7.

<sup>71</sup> *Constituent Assembly Debates*, 9, 2, pp. 1333-4, 1454-59

of Muslim conventions, proposed that Hindustani should be the national language of India and that it should be written in both the scripts, Devanagari and Urdu. Qazi Syed Karimuddin, (C.P. and Berar), too, proposed a similar amendment. Mohamed Ismail, later the revivifier of the Muslim League, proposed an identical amendment, very properly replacing the word "national" in Hifzur Rahman's amendment by "official". The amendment, when put to vote, received only 14 affirmative votes, "the rest, a large majority" voting against, and was thus lost.<sup>72</sup>

The desiderata of the Amendments proposed by Muslim leaders in the Constituent Assembly during 1948-49, hardly any so-called National or Congress Muslim opposing them, will be found to recur in the deliberations and demands of the various sessions of either the Muslim Convention or the Muslim League or both, which began to be a regular affair since 1951. The leaders and proponents, too, of these sessions and demands and the voices of the so-called grievances will be found to have come from the same source.

Azad specifies<sup>73</sup> his general remark that his prophesy of April 1946 had come true by pointing out the difficulties encountered by Pakistan within its borders. He says: "No one can hope that East and West Pakistan will compose all their differences and form one nation."

We know today that under President Marshal Ayub Khan what Azad thought to be an impossibility for ever is nearing achievement within a decade of his frustrated sense painting very depressing and dolorous pictures of Pakistan! From other chapters of this book the reader will gather how Muslim Indians, particularly persons like Dr Syed Mahmud, who after having been a member of the Congress Working Committee for sometime was a member of the Congress-based Government, too, for some years, are giving vent to their sense of frustration through regenerating the very Muslim League (that broke up pre-1947 India) or a similar body and claiming to the Muslims in India fullest special treatment as a religious and cultural minority. The goings on at the Aligarh Muslim University since 1953 to date, which are briefly narrated in another chapter, bear still another and an even more poignant testimony to the feelings of chagrin and frustration which the Muslims in India entertain.

The special correspondent of *The Hindustan Times* (17-11-1953) reporting on the All-India Muslim Convention, held at Aligarh from 30 October to 3 November, a fortnight after it was over, makes the following observations which are very pertinent to my submission made here about the feelings of chagrin and frustration among Muslims in India. He says:

The principal targets of attack in the convention's resolutions are evacuee laws, joint electorate, abolition of reservation of seats and percen-

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1339-45, 1366-68, 1463, 1472-74.

<sup>73</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 225-27.

tages in appointments to the public services and language policy . . . it is an open secret that wealth in various forms is flying from U.P. to Pakistan. *There is hardly a well-to-do family that is not represented in the armed forces or civil service of Pakistan.\** It would be crying for the moon to expect undivided allegiance from those that have daughters on this side of the border and sons on the other. The traffic between Aligarh and Western Pakistan is so constant that the office of the superintendent of police is continually inundated with applications for passports . . . it is no secret that the local engineering college is producing engineers and technicians largely for Pakistan.

Another piece of supporting evidence comes from the pen of a well-known Australian Professor of Geography, who wrote his book *India and Pakistan* in 1954, recording his findings from the viewpoint of a human geographer. The author, Professor O. H. K. Spate<sup>74</sup> observes:

But large parts of it [Hyderabad State] were still under practically feudal *jagirs* and the tension between a Muslim aristocracy and bureaucracy, and the Maratha Telugu peasantry was a fundamental weakness. *As the only notable survivor of the Muslim Mogul succession states, it was an Islamic cultural and political outlier fatally isolated from the Islamic bases in the North West and North East.* These things were obvious to a casual traveller.

One of the most incontestable piece of evidence of these feelings was what is now known as the tragedy of Hyderabad. Hyderabad helmsman of the time, when the tragedy was enacted, himself has narrated it in his book *Tragedy of Hyderabad* published in 1962. A perusal of it will convince the reader how the fate of Hyderabad is the most eloquent testimony to the thesis put forward here regarding the uprise of the feelings of chagrin and frustration among Muslims, both Pakistani and Indian. For those who cannot afford to go through that book, here is a quotation from W. C. Smith,<sup>75</sup> one of the most sympathetic students of Muslims in India over a long period having deep personal contacts among them. Smith says:

The most spectacular instance of this [the uncovering of Muslim weakness], and of Muslim blind fury in protest against it, was the 1948 Hyderabad tragedy. This illustrates further one more attempt of the Indian Muslims not to accept their position in a democratic India.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>74</sup> *India and Pakistan*, 1954, p. 675. Italics mine.

<sup>75</sup> *Islam in Modern History*, 1957, p. 278.

## CHAPTER

### 10

## HINDU-MUSLIM RIOTS

By anomic interest groups we mean more or less spontaneous break-throughs into the political system from the society, such as riots and demonstrations.\*

GABRIEL A. ALMOND

SINCE VERY EARLY in the settlement of the Muslims in India clashes between them and the Hindus may be presumed to have been a recurrent feature, where the Hindus felt themselves fairly strong and were not wholly cowed down by the military exploits and ruthless use of power of the Muslims. This inference flows from the earliest of the recorded situations of such recurrent clashes in the far off southern region of the country even before the Muslim arms under Allauddin Khilji had reached there. Ibn Battuta,<sup>1</sup> a zealous Muslim and a fairly accurate recorder of matters of interest, in his long tours made during the second quarter of the 14th century, has noted that there was a colony of about 4,000 Muslims at Manjasur [Mangalore?] ruled over by Rama Dev, "living in a suburb alongside the town". He further observes about their relations with the Hindus of the place: "Conflicts frequently break out between them and the towns people, but the Sultan [Rajah?] makes peace between them on account of his need of the merchants."

Recently Mohammad Yasin<sup>2</sup> has observed that during the later Moghul period, 1605 to 1748 A.D., "the relations among the Muslims and Hindus were cordial, and characterized by good-will, mutual love and toleration"

N.B. I record with pleasure that I received good deal of material for this chapter from the notes made for me in 1952-53 by Dr L. N. Chapekar and Dr M. S. A. Rao, who were then Research Assistants in Sociology in the Department of Sociology, University of Bombay.

\* Professor Gabriel A. Almond in Almond and Coleman, *The Politics of Developing Areas*, p. 34.

<sup>1</sup> *Travels in Asia and Africa*, Trans. by H. A. R. Gibb (1929), pp. 233-34.

<sup>2</sup> *A Social History of Islamic India*, 1958, pp. 50-1.



and that "the fact is borne out by the whole history of Muslim rule in India where, except in the time of later Moghuls, there were communal riots on the mass scale, which may be ascribed to the mounting reaction of the seventeenth century". Dr Yasin's meticulous investigation and refreshingly frank and rational attitude are so praiseworthy that I should not have liked to demur to his observation but for the fact that his dictum in the earlier portion of his remarks goes beyond his own evidence. The relations can be described as those of toleration and absence of positive ill-will but certainly not positively of mutual love in any part of the period specified.

In 1713 A.D., according to Khafi Khan, there was what he called religious disturbance which took place at Ahmedabad in Gujarat. As this is the first riot properly so called, described by one who appears to have been an eye-witness, I shall give a few instructive details from the account. One Hindu gentleman whose house faced that of a Mussalman across a common courtyard prepared to burn the *holi* \* in front of his house but the Mussalman objected. The local official who was a Muslim gave his decision in favour of the Hindu and the latter burnt the *holi*. The next day the Mussalman gentleman, "desiring to give an entertainment in honour of the Prophet", slaughtered a cow in front of his house. All the nearby Hindus immediately assembled and attacked the Mussalmans found there. They even killed the son of a cow-butcher, a lad of fourteen. This enraged the Mussalmans who gathered together in large numbers and were joined by Afghans who were the regular soldiery. "In the riots many shops were destroyed." Many houses, too, of the Hindus were burnt. Numbers of Hindus and Mussalmans were killed. "The riot reached such a pitch that for three or four days all business and work in Ahmedabad was suspended. A large number of the leaders of both sides resolved to appeal to the Emperor."<sup>3</sup> The same author describes a riot that occurred in Kashmir in 1719-20 A.D. But in origin it was a vendetta of a Muslim gentleman of position against the Hindus.<sup>4</sup> Rustam Ali describes a riot which took place in Delhi in about 1729 A.D. The cause of it seems to have been the murder of a Mussalman by a Hindu for reasons not given by the reporter. The Mussalmans who had gathered together in the Jama Masjid for their Friday prayers rose in tumult and at about 3 o'clock "a great fight took place. Seventeen men were killed in the Masjid".<sup>5</sup>

A little over half a century after the Kashmir affair, in September 1786, in the heart of the country under the nose of the Maratha powers, during

\* A holiday observed by Hindus by lighting a huge fire and is accompanied by shouting of slogans, mostly abusive. It has been on its decline except for the merry sprinkling of coloured water or powders over one another.

<sup>3</sup> Elliot and Dowson, VII, pp. 454 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 492 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Elliot and Dowson, VIII, p. 48.

what was evidently their heyday of power and glory, at Balapur and other places in Berar (Vidarbha) the Muslims perpetrated outrages on the religious sentiments of the Hindus and actually attacked with war weapons a large congregation of religious-songs-chanters at a Brahmin house on the particularly sacred day of the bright eleventh of Asadha. While the Hindus were engrossed in their religious performance one Muslim by name of Pirji gathered the Muslims of the locality and arming them with weapons attacked the party at prayers. The people were taken by surprise and unguarded; yet it appears they offered resistance. Four of them were killed and about 20 injured in the fray. A "kathi"-procession, religious procession with banners fluttering on staves, a speciality of Maharashtrian religious practice noticed as current even to-day, as for example, in Haveli taluka,<sup>6</sup> from Morehdpur was attacked and broken up by Muslims ('avin-dha' of the Marathi letter on the subject) while in some places the idols of Hanuman, the monkey-god, were defiled by putting shoes-garland round their necks.<sup>7</sup>

Within 25 years after the last described incident, Banaras figures in the riots arena. But the description of the riots of 1809 A.D. given in the District Gazetteer of Banaras<sup>8</sup> makes it quite clear that it was "*one of those convulsions which had frequently occurred in the past owing to the religious antagonism between the Hindu and Mussalman sections of the population*". The chief source of conflict was the mosque built by Aurangzeb on the site of an old temple. The serious nature of the riots can be gathered from the fact that "order was not restored by the troops until some fifty mosques were destroyed and several hundred persons had lost their lives". In 1837 A.D. the Muslim Moharram and the Hindu Ramanavami festivals fell on the same day. There was disturbance of peace in Bareilly, which assisted by other causes continued till the autumn of 1838.<sup>9</sup> In the Moradabad Hindu-Muslim riots which took place in 1840 A.D., 14 lives were lost.<sup>10</sup> It seems that in the then United Provinces as an aftermath of the so-called Mutiny of 1857, there were Hindu-Muslim riots not only in the district of Moradabad but also in the district of Bijnor.<sup>11</sup>

In 1871, the Moharram festival again synchronized with the Hindu festival, Ramanavami, and a serious riot was the consequence in Bareilly. The editor of *The District Gazetteer of Bareilly*, H. R. Nevill, says that in that particular riot, the Muslim community had evidently premeditated the aggression. The Mahant who carried the image of Rama, on his return journey, was attacked and murdered. "The Mussalmans then broke up into

<sup>6</sup> See my *Anatomy of a Rururban Community*, 1963.

<sup>7</sup> T. S. Shejwalkar, *Nagpur Affairs* (in Marathi), Vol. 21, 1959, p. 63.

<sup>8</sup> H. R. Nevill, *District Gazetteer of Banaras* (1909), pp. 207-8.

<sup>9</sup> *District Gazetteer of Bareilly*, ed. by H. R. Nevill (1911), pp. 168-9.

<sup>10</sup> *District Gazetteer of Moradabad*, pp. 161-2.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 167.

gangs, which fell back on the city intent on plunder and rapine, and quiet was restored on the appearance of troops from the Cantonment.”<sup>12</sup> In another town of the United Provinces, Pilibhit, on the same day, Hindu-Muslim riots occurred owing to Mussalman aggression. As two different routes for the processions of the Muslims and the Hindus respectively were not possible owing to the geography of the place, two different times of the day were prescribed. The Muslims purposely delayed their procession. And as the time of the start approached the time that was given to the Hindus the Magistrate forbade the procession. There was an attack by the Muslims on the other procession! “. . . a riot ensued, several shops were plundered and burnt, eventually the police were ordered to fire.” The disorder, however, did not completely disappear till the arrival of the cavalry on the following day.<sup>13</sup>

In South India, as we have already seen, Hindu-Muslim riots are reported from the middle of the fourteenth century. From the description given by Ibn Battuta, the Muslims involved appear to be the forefathers of the Moplahs. “The great uprising” of the Moplahs in 1921 will be referred to later. After the beginning of the 19th century the earliest trouble that is recorded occurred in 1873. As W. R. Smith remarks: “A Moplah outbreak usually begins with the assassination of a landlord [the bulk of whom are Hindus], the looting of a Hindu shop, or the defiling of a Hindu temple.” The Moplah used to work in small gangs but fought with desperate fanaticism. As a precaution against sudden outbreaks, the British Government, since 1873, stationed a small detachment of troops at the principal centre of the Moplahs. After another riot in 1885 as a further precaution, a special police force was added. In spite of all precautions, however, two more riots, in 1894 and 1896, are recorded by W. R. Smith.<sup>14</sup> Another riot nearer the next chain reaction occurred in the Central Provinces in 1889.<sup>15</sup>

The next era of Hindu-Muslim riots was begun in 1893 by a riot which occurred on the occasion of Moharram festival on 25 July at Prabhaspatan near Veraval in Saurashtra. It had its repercussions at various other places. In Bombay city, a serious riot which began in August of the same year lasted 3 days. It was so serious that troops had to be put into action to quell it. About 25,000 people were concerned in the outbreak; 81 persons were killed, 46 of them being Muslims, 34 Hindus and one Jew. Many mosques and temples were desecrated and many shops pillaged.

It is necessary to record here that the cause of this “the worst of the outbreaks of violence ever known in Bombay” was “an impression that they [Muslims] needed special protection and that the European system of administration tended to increase the influence of the Hindus at their

<sup>12</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 179-80.

<sup>13</sup> H. R. Nevill, *District Gazetteer of Pilibhit* (1909), pp. 166-7.

<sup>14</sup> *Nationalism and Reform in India* (1938), pp. 315-16.

<sup>15</sup> C. P. Govt. Memorandum, to the Simon Commission.

expense".<sup>16</sup> On 20 September in a village of Pen taluka of Kolaba district in a fracas that took place 14 persons were wounded.<sup>17</sup> In Ballia district of the U.P., in the same year, as a reaction to the cow-protection movement started by the Hindus, at various places there were riots. The first shot was fired at Mau, a town with nearly 9,500 Muslims and 8,200 Hindus. An unusually large number of the Muslims were Julahs, weavers, "the most fanatical and turbulent section of the Mussalman community". Bands from this district worked in Azamgad district. The Hindus of Azamgad demanded that the Muslims should not sacrifice cows at Bakri Id, and a riot occurred on 25 June, a crowd of about 2,000 Muslims having advanced to attack the town of Mau. On the same occasion a less serious disturbance of public peace occurred at Bareilly.<sup>18</sup>

On 6 February 1894 the suppressed feelings and tensions of the previous year broke out in the form of serious riots at Yeola in Nasik district, which were quelled with the help of the military after 5 persons were killed and 25 injured and considerable damage to property was done.<sup>19</sup> The Bombay Administrative Report 1895-96,<sup>20</sup> referring to the Hindu-Muslim dissensions prevailing "throughout the Presidency in preceding years", states that though they were not so very prominent during the year under report yet at some places, which were quiet in the preceding years, they broke out in the open in the form of riots. At Porbandar in Saurashtra, on 4 July 1895, while a Muslim procession was passing through Hindu quarters, the local inhabitants attacked it. In the melee 3 persons were killed and 30 injured. In the same year in August-September a Ganapati procession at Dhulia in Khandesh district was attacked by Muslims who were lying in wait with the usual missiles in a mosque and the police had to open fire.

There followed lull for about ten years, though two movements started by the Hindus, viz., one against cow-slaughter, and the other of public Ganapati processions, went on from strength to strength. The partition of Bengal made in 1905, the great revival of Kali worship, giving it the form of group performance on the pattern of the Ganapati festival and the inauguration of the Boycott of foreign goods initiated the new era of riots in Bengal. It began with a serious riot between Hindus and Muslims at Mograhat in Tippera district, early in 1907, and did not end till 1909 as shown by the quartering of the detachment of military police in the district. The district of Malda, too, seems to have had some riots during some

<sup>16</sup> *Report on the Administration of the Bombay Presidency, 1893-4*, p. IV; S. M. Edwardes, *The Gazetteer of Bombay*, (1919) Vol. I, p. 35, Vol. II, pp. 192-4.

<sup>17</sup> *Report on the Administration of the Bombay Presidency, 1893-4*, p. IV.

<sup>18</sup> *Ballia District Gazetteer*, pp. 160-1; *Azamgad District Gazetteer*, pp. 177-8; *Bareilly District Gazetteer*, p. 180.

<sup>19</sup> *Bombay Administration Report, 1893-4*, p. v.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp iv-v.

years though the one occurring in 1918 is the only one actually referred to in my sources of information.<sup>21</sup>

With the onset of the new political era of the Montford scheme and the popularization of political agitation, riots between Hindus and Muslims once again leapt into the arena, as if to remind the public and the Government that the Hindus and Muslims had become conscious of the imminent change of power and were intent on having it distributed according to their desires.

This new era was begun with a riot in Malegaon in Nasik district in April 1921. But the "rebellion" of the Moplahs, which started in Malabar in the month of August, threw it into the background. Bangalore followed in the November of the year.<sup>22</sup>

In September 1922, there were serious Hindu-Muslim riots at Multan in connection with the Moharram festival.<sup>23</sup>

In the year 1923, there occurred between 15 to 20 serious riots all over India, amongst which those of Amritsar, Lahore and Saharanpur figure prominently.<sup>24</sup>

In 1924, Allahabad, Calcutta, Delhi, Gulbarga, Jabulpore, Kohat, Lucknow, Nagpur and Shahjahanpur figured as rioting centres. At Delhi it is difficult to decide whether there were two riots or one between 22 June and 15 July.<sup>25</sup>

The first open outbreak was on the 11th July when an insignificant quarrel between some Kachar Hindus and a Mohammedan boy occasioned a serious rioting. This was followed in the next 3 days by a serious Mohammedan attack on Hindus resulting in three Hindus killed and 50 injured. On the 15th, the Bakr-Id day a wild riot broke out again. The cause of the trouble was that on the morning of the 15th the local authorities proclaimed the special closing of an additional route through the Hindu quarters for cows destined for slaughter. This order was resented by the Moslems. They tried to take a cow by the prohibited road and serious rioting took place. Military came in. Some 12 Hindus were killed by the Moslem butchers and about hundred received serious injuries. There were minor casualties amongst the Moslems too. Sporadic attacks continued specially by Moslem goondas, and even a Hindu temple was desecrated.

<sup>21</sup> *District Gazetteer of Tippera* (1910), p. 20, *District Gazetteer of Malda* (1918), p. 23.

<sup>22</sup> *Bombay in 1921-2* (A Review of the Administration of the Presidency), pp. 2-3, W. R. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 314-6; *Times of India Year Book*, 1922.

<sup>23</sup> *Times of India Year Book*, 1923.

<sup>24</sup> *Indian Year Book*, 1924; *The Quarterly Register*, 1924.

<sup>25</sup> This and subsequent data are culled from the *Indian Quarterly Register* and the *Indian Annual Register*.

The Gulbarga riot is described as unique because before its occurrence "a Hindu-Moslem riot in an Indian State was never heard of". Gulbarga is an important Muslim town in what was then the State of Hyderabad of the then Exalted Highness, the Nizam of Hyderabad.

Communal trouble which was brewing in Gulbarga for some time past developed on the day previous to the Moharram, when idols of a Hindu temple were taken out in a procession. The procession was obstructed by Mahommedans. The procession returned. On the following day some Mahommedans molested Hindu men and women and then entered the Sharan Vishveshvar temple and did some damage. Next day a story went round that the Hindus had caused mischief to a mosque. Thereupon Mahommedan mobs attacked all Hindu temples in the city numbering about 15 and broke the idols. The police opened fire. Three Mahommedans were killed and a dozen persons injured. Next day Mahommedans damaged Hindu houses, and shops. On 14th August almost every temple (about 50 in number) was desecrated.<sup>26</sup>

1925 seems to be rather quiet year registering only one riot in Calcutta. But 1926 amply made up for the calm of the preceding year. Second April witnessed riots at various places, that at Calcutta being the most serious. It continued with a slight interval till 9 May, broke out again on 11 July and was not finally set at rest till 25th. At Delhi, Pabna and Rawalpindi, riots occurred in between and were followed in September by those at Allahabad and Dacca.

The year 1927 records no less than 17 riots beginning with January 26th and ending with November 14th. Patuakhali riots in January were followed by those in Ponabalia, both in Eastern Bengal. And for a time the scene of riots shifted to Larkana and later to Lahore. The Lahore riot synchronized with one at Surat. At Dinapur in Patna the Bakri-Id sacrifice of a cow resulted in a serious riot in June. Multan, Bettiah in Bihar, Comilla in Bengal, and Bareilly in U.P. figured as riot centres, one after another, between June and August. The serious riot that occurred at Nagpur on 4 and 5 September was the result of a Muslim procession of 2,000 people molesting a Hindu passerby. Heavy casualties were recorded. The trouble that started at Ahmedabad on 11 September arose out of a party of Muslims offering prayers in a mosque coming into conflict with a song and religious discourse party of Hindus in an adjoining temple. On 28 September a riot occurred at Delhra Dun in connection with Ramlila procession. On the 14 November Abdul Rashid, the murderer of Swami Shradhdhanand, was hanged at Delhi. A huge Muslim crowd carried the body in a procession which proved so riotous that 45 Hindus were injured in the melee.

<sup>26</sup> *Indian Quarterly Register*, Vol. II, pp. 25-6.

In 1928, riots at Bangalore, Surat, Nasik, Hyderabad and Kalipalayam were recorded. Bombay's riots in 1929 were the most serious and perhaps the only ones in India in the year. An aggravating cause in this case was some labour dispute. Bombay had another riot in 1930 in which year Dacca suffered twice from such disturbances. In 1931 in British-administered India Banaras was the only place which experienced disturbance of peace for 3 days in February. In 1932 again Bombay's peace was disturbed twice in May and again in June and July. Two other places, namely Alwar, and Bhudala in Hissar district figured as centres of communal riots for the first time. The Alwar riots which took place in May had reverberations in the next year on 5 January. The two other riots that occurred in 1933 were in Bengal, at Calcutta and at Beldanga in Murshidabad district. Of the two riots recorded in 1934, one occurred in Bahiranga, a village in the district of Muzaffarpur, and the other at Cannanore in Malabar, which was quiet for a dozen years or so. The year 1935 began with a riot on 12 April at Hazaribagh in Bihar. The day happened to be the day of Ramanavami and Moharram. To avoid trouble the authorities directed the Muslims not to start their procession until the evening by which time the Hindu celebration was expected to be over. Muslims, unwilling to agree, started rioting. Two days later one of the worst incidents attending such riots occurred at Firozabad in Agra district. The Muslims committed the most heinous outrage in burning to death 11 Hindus including 3 children by setting fire to Dr Jivaram's house. In August the scene changed over to Phenhera, district Champaran in Bihar, and to south in Sikandarabad. Lahore was the scene of riots from 26 November to 2 December. On the 26 January in the next year the communities that had clashed in Lahore came into a serious clash at Dhudial in Jhelum district. Poona which had experienced communal concord for a long time, was roused into a serious Hindu-Muslim clash on 24 April 1936. About the same time or a day or two earlier a Hindu-Muslim fracas occurred in the small town of Khanapur in Belgaum district. On 27 April a Hindu wedding procession passing with music before the mosque at Jamalpur in Monghyr district was attacked by Muslims. The Byculla temple-mosque dispute in Bombay culminated in a riot on 15 and was not completely quelled before 30 November. The total number of dead was near 80 and of the injured more than 500.

The new political set-up, as the result of which the Indian National Congress came into power in 1937, produced a comparative lull in the rioting activity. Only a few disturbances at a cattle fair in U.P. were reported on the 4 November 1937; and 1938 passed without any incident. In 1939, however, there was a recrudescence which began with a riot at Asansol, a Railway junction in Bengal on the 21 January. The next day Delhi witnessed a clash. And Cawnpore followed on the 11 February. The Cawnpore affair started as an attack by Muslims on a Hindu marriage party and continued as a serious riot for some days to be fanned again as a reper-

cussion of other riots on 4 March. About 50 persons were killed and more than 300 persons were injured. On 1 March in a number of towns in U.P. Hindus and Muslims clashed, the incident at Banaras being the most serious. On the occasion of the Holi holiday, which occurred on the 5 March, Banaras was again convulsed by a communal riot. The serious Hindu-Muslim clash at Cassipore near Calcutta the same day had its repercussions in a number of places near Calcutta, the next day. On the 7 May the riots at Gaya accounted for 11 persons killed and over 90 injured. On 21 May Sholapur's peace was disturbed. The Rathayatra festival brought in its wake a communal riot at Cawnpore on the 19 June. On the 4 October Meerut registered a serious disturbance of peace. November 20 and 21 witnessed a riot in an altogether quiet place in Sindh, Sukkur, where the only communal disturbance of peace in India of 1940 occurred on the 19 February. In 1941 Calcutta had the honour of beginning the trouble on the 8 of February on the occasion of the Moharram. It continued for 3 or 4 days. The communal riot that started at Ahmedabad on the 18 April did not subside till the 22nd. It was followed by a much more serious riot in Bombay city which started on the 25 April and cannot be said to have been completely over till the 3 June. Bihar witnessed communal fracas towards the end of April and its recrudescence in June.

The information listed above is culled from sources which cannot be expected to have reported all riots, or clashes that may have taken place anywhere at any time in India. Within my experience clashes or quarrels occurred more than once at Badlapur and Bhivandi near Bombay which never got any mention in the sources utilized.

The four years beginning from 1942 were entirely quiet. However, the year 1946 made up for all this. The expectancy of power-transfer and a sort of a frustrated feeling at its unsatisfactory nature are largely responsible for the large number of riots in that year. I shall pass them over as the doings of a frenzied population, mentioning that about 50 days in all were spent in communal riots. Ahmedabad, Calcutta, Allahabad, Bombay, Noakhali, Patna, Bhagalpore, Dacca are the chief places where they occurred. Those of Noakhali, Calcutta and Bombay were repeated more than once and were very serious.

On the 15 August 1947 with the end of the British dominion in India, there emerged the two independent nations and countries of India (Bharat) and Pakistan. The behaviour of the two communities since that date for some time thereafter was so abnormal owing to the very peculiar and novel circumstances that for understanding the problem of Muslims in India it cannot be taken into account. With the declaration by the Union of India on the 26 January 1949 of its being a Republic and with the promulgation of the Constitution of India we are face to face with the problem of the Muslims in Republican India, though they are not specifically named in the Constitution as a minority.



In India under British dominion the relative proportion of Muslims to the total population in general and to the majority community, in particular, had been on the increase since 1881. To confine our attention to the situation prevailing immediately before the emergence of Republican India, we find that there were 2,216 and 2,381 Muslims per 10,000 Indians in the years 1931 and 1941 respectively. Of these the Hindus proper, exclusive of Sikhs, the Jains and the Tribals, numbered 6,824 and 6,593 in every 10,000 Indians respectively. In Republican India, according to the statistics made available for 1951 in respect of limited area of the Indian Republic out of every 10,000 Indians 8,499 were Hindus and 993 Muslims. The proportion of Muslims to the total population in Republican India would thus appear to have been reduced very considerably. Whereas in 1941 the Muslims appear to have formed about 24 per cent of the total Indians, in 1951 they were only 9.91 per cent. But it must be remembered that figures for Jammu and Kashmir are not included in the Census data of 1951.<sup>27</sup> The Census Superintendent has presented comparable figures for 1921, 1931 and 1951 omitting in both cases figures for Assam, Jammu-Kashmir, the Punjab and West Bengal. In every 10,000 Indians in 1921 and 1951 the Hindus numbered 8,440 and 8,689, while the Muslims totalled 957 and 909 respectively. These figures indicate that the relative proportions of the two communities in the States of Republican India cannot be very different from those of pre-Republican days.

To confine our attention to those areas which used to be disturbed most by communal riots, we see that the proportion of Muslims is markedly reduced only in West Bengal where their proportion of 25.38 per cent in 1911 was reduced to 19.85 in 1951.<sup>28</sup> In Uttar Pradesh where the trial of strength of the two communities has been made on innumerable occasions in the past and where, in the light of recent developments to be referred to later, new conflict may arise, the Muslims formed 14.28 per cent of the population, a figure at which they stood in 1911. In Bombay State Muslims who formed 8.09 per cent of the population were actually in a higher proportion than that of 1921, which was 7.94. They had grown in 20 years and had in 1941 formed 8.47 per cent of the population. The proportional vicissitudes of the Hindu community have been comparatively smaller. They formed 88.78, 88.18 and 88.40 \* per cent in 1921, 1941 and 1951 respectively.

In 1961 (*Census of India, Paper No. 1 of 1963*) Muslims formed 10.69 per cent of the total population, Christians 2.44, Sikhs 1.79, Buddhists 0.74, Jains 0.46, others 0.37 and Hindus 83.51.

With the new set-up, reporting of riots has been so controlled that it

<sup>27</sup> Paper No. 2.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, pp 19-29

\* According to the corrected statement made in Paper No. 1 of 1963 of Census of India 1961, this figure ought to be 84.98!

becomes difficult to be sure about definite figures. Search through the reports in the columns of the daily *The Times of India* has revealed ample evidence that communal riots have not ceased. In 1949, Secunderabad and Hyderabad in the South, Saharanpur and Hambal in the Uttar Pradesh, and Calcutta and Akola witnessed fairly serious riots between the two communities. The trouble at Saharanpur seems to have started round a tonga which was suspected to be carrying beef through a Hindu locality. The riot at Hambal, a village in Azamgarh district, ensued as a result of the slaughter of three cows. The Akola riot started the next day after the slaughter of a cow in a Muslim household on 24 June.

In 1950, there was a spate of riots not only in Calcutta and Delhi but at other places like Pilbhit, Katni, Nagpur, Aligarh, Dhubri in Assam, Bombay, Ahmedabad, rural areas of Shahjahanpur and Almora. It is not possible, from the accounts, to separate reprisals from ordinary riots. 1951 was quiet excepting for disturbances at Mangrol, a place about 30 miles from Surat. In 1952, in Banaras communal trouble occurred on 23 March when the Hindus tried to carry out repairs to a place of worship of theirs adjacent to a mosque, though these were sanctioned by the City Magistrate after mutual agreement between the two communities.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan informed the Parliament of Pakistan on 30 September that 93 cases of communal incidents in India had been brought to the notice of the Pakistani Government during 1952-53.<sup>29</sup> Search of the columns of *The Times of India* has revealed only a much smaller number of these incidents.

On the occasion of Holi festival on 1 March trouble occurred at Viramgaon and Bhopal. At Viramgaon, the immediate cause was stone-throwing by some miscreants at a procession taken out by the Hindu Mahasabha to protest against cow-slaughter. The incidents that occurred were after the patterns of similar riots during the thirties. The trouble at Bhopal did not develop much and ended with a few clashes.<sup>30</sup>

The Muslim festival of Id in August 1953 brought in a fracas at Gauhati in Assam when an angry crowd tried to prevent a Muslim family from sacrificing a cow (*Times of India*, 22-8-53).

The Maharashtrian festival of Ganesh or Ganapati, the elephant-headed god, and the Muslim observance of Moharram coincided in the month of September.<sup>31</sup> And we record from the news items the repercussions of the coincidence on social peace, on tension and conflict between the two communities, Hindus and Muslims, in the orders issued by the District Magistrates or their equivalents or/and, in the fracas between the two communities in Ahmedabad, Nasik, Poona, Sangli and Sholapur.

In Ahmedabad the Magistrate "banned all processions during the Mohar-

<sup>29</sup> *Times of India*, 2-10-1953.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 9, 12, 13, 20, 21, 24, 26-9-1953.

<sup>31</sup> See my *Gods and Men*, 1962.

ram days [ten] within the municipal limits for 15 days from the 12th September" (*Times of India*, 13-9-'53). From Nasik the news was flashed on the 11th that the police and the Congress leaders were taking "all possible precautions to avert communal clashes . . . following the receipt of anonymous letters by some citizens threatening communal trouble". Seventy Congressmen in a meeting issued an appeal to the residents to "maintain cordial communal relations during the festivals [of Ganesh and Moharram]". They also appointed "a peace committee for the maintenance of peaceful relations between different communities" (*Times of India*, 12-9-'53). The same issue of the paper contained the news that at Sangli, a prohibitory order promulgated a ban for 12 days from the 10th on "the carrying of lethal weapons in any public place in the district" and also on "public utterances or 'abusive songs and aggressive gestures' which are likely to create communal tension". As my collection of cuttings does not contain any, giving further developments in these places, I must take it, though I cannot be certain, that there occurred no untoward incident there and that the precautionary measures achieved their purpose of keeping overt communal peace.

Poona, on the other hand, figures in the news, off and on, from the 8 to 20 of September, recording not only high tension owing to the very stringent prohibitory orders but some fracas, enough to enable *The Times* news-serviceman to give the heading "Arson bid in Poona" to his advice from that place on 19 September.

Near "Sonya Maruti",<sup>32</sup> Golden Maruti (the monkey-god), described in the news as and known from past experience to be a "trouble spot", there was a likelihood of both the Hindu idol and the Muslim symbol being installed adjunctly. The Magistrate apprehending the potentialities of the situation for trouble prohibited on the 8th the installation of both. The issue of the paper for 13th informs us that the Magistrate had called in and had asked to stand by "a special reserve [Police] force from Dhond". Besides, stringent restrictions on loud-speakers, "mandaps" i.e., pandals, and "inelas" i.e., songster-troupes were imposed. Even "reputed classical singers" were "required to obtain licences for their performances during the festival". The news-serviceman observes: "Not until 1947 had the Government placed any restrictions on the singing of songs and other propaganda though 'inelas' had been subjected to restrictions for a long time." This time the prohibitory and restrictive orders were more stringent than even the "ukases", in the phrasology of Congressmen, of the "Satanic" British raj in India in the most tense period of the national struggle in Bombay when Lokmanya Tilak was tried and sentenced for treason in 1908! Needless to point out that public enthusiasm was thoroughly damped.

The action and the event which had specially raised the expectation of

<sup>32</sup> For the naming of temples and gods in Poona see my *Gods and Men*.

ecolat for the public also had given the authorities an idea of the possibilities of the situation creating high tension and ugly conflicts. The Ganesh or Ganapati festival in the organized form had completed its first sixty years, having been started by Lokmanya Tilak in 1893. And the Ganesh Mandal Society, evidently of Poona, had just then published a 600-page history of the celebration of the Ganesh festival during that sixty year period. The public was thus on the tiptoe of high expectations, special performances being naturally expected as the festival was designed for the propaganda of the national movement for independence or Swaraj, and had served its purpose quite fittingly, nothing could be more natural than such an expectation after the achievement of its national goal on its sixty-first "birth day"! Too much loudness in the vicinity of Muslim installations for the Moharram was certain to ensue in a fracas somewhere or the other. And that would have been sufficient to start communal conflagration!

With all the precaution, however, the issue of *The Times of India* for 20th gave the news that two persons were arrested for setting fire to the dome of the "Taboot" or "Tazia" the processional car of bamboo, paper and tinsel, made for the celebration of Moharram, at one of the places, and also that more than one attempt was made by persons to instal the image of Ganapati at the prohibited spot and foiled by the Police, who also arrested some persons. On 20th i.e., the last day of the festival, the day of immersion-processions a mild "lathi"-charge too had to be made (*Times of India*, 21-9-53).

In Sholapur, where on the Ganapati immersion day a gathering of more than four persons and processions were prohibited by the Police, a procession in front of a mosque was stopped by them as the processionists were bent on playing music before it. The Police arrested the Hindu Mahasabha leader and seven other persons in connection with the music and the resulting fracas. So flashed the news in the issue of *The Times of India* for 24 September, with the rider that, having witnessed the fracas on the 22nd the city was quiet on 23rd. But the issue of 26th reported that on 23rd the usual aftermath of the Hindu rage, shops in the bazaars remained closed in protest against the stoppage of the procession by the Police, and that the police ban was in force till 25th.

On the last day of the month, at Jamnagar occurred a clash, evidently between the same two communities, resulting from "a minor incident of a boy indulging in pranks near a hotel". Four men having been injured, the Police arrested a number of persons among whom was a member of the Saurashtra Assembly—Saurashtra was a separate State then and not a part of Bombay or Gujarat. The "clash" was described as serious and the Police imposed a ban "on carrying lethal weapons", which the report says comprised "lathis [sticks], stones and other missiles [?]"'. The Chief Minister immediately held consultations with the leading citizens of Jamnagar. However, in the brief interval "a section of Jamnagar", as the report says with-

out specifying that it was the Muslim or the Hindu community of Jamnagar, wired to the President and the Prime Minister of India "asking protection of life and property". (*The Times of India*, 1-10-'53).

The same day in the Parliament of Pakistan the Foreign Minister, Zafarul Khan, made a statement that during 1952-53 there had occurred in India 93 communal incidents, alleging forcible conversions as an adjunct to the disturbances.

Slaughter of a stolen cow brought on a riot at Gaziabad in the Uttar Pradesh on 6 January 1954, in which about a dozen persons were injured and property worth Rs. 5,000 was looted. In the sequel 21 persons including the six alleged to have been responsible for the slaughter were arrested by the Police (*Times of India*, 9-1-'54).

On 6 June at Aligarh, a riot occurred as a result of "a trifling and sudden dispute over the price of a melon" between a hawker and a customer. The riot appears to have been a fairly serious affair, though no fatal casualties occurred—only a few cases of arson with loot and stray assaults being reported and the situation coming under control within an hour. Eight persons had received injuries and six persons were arrested.

On 15 August, the Independence day, at Nizamabad in Hyderabad, some persons hoisted the Pakistani national flag on the statue of Mahatma Gandhi in the main bazaar of the town. When the news spread in the town later, a serious riot broke out requiring the curfew to be imposed soon after, as shops and houses were being set on fire and women too were being molested. Three days thereafter it was the turn of Hyderabad city itself to be the scene of a riot on the same issue. The Pakistani national flag was hoisted by some persons in Goshamahal, a suburb of Hyderabad. The incident led to "minor disturbances" in the suburb, which were soon put down by the timely arrival of the Police on the scene. A demonstration was being planned with the usual accompaniment of "slogans" in front of the hall of the State Assembly over the Nizamabad affair, and the Police Commissioner had to issue an order banning such demonstrations within a radius of 500 yards of the hall to ensure peaceful conduct of Assembly work. In the Government statement it was made clear that Government fully appreciated the indignation and annoyance caused to the public by such an act as the hoisting of the Pakistani national flag, but warned the people against taking any reprisals as that meant taking the law into one's own hands and would be severely dealt with. However, a Muslim member of the Assembly, Akhtar Hussain, who belonged to People's Democratic Front party, tabled a motion for the adjournment of the House "to discuss the serious situation that had arisen in Nizamabad in the wake of communal disturbances", alleging that "the authorities had not taken timely steps to prevent the disturbances". The Deputy Home Minister submitted that the matter was "subjudice" and the motion should not be allowed. My cuttings do not contain any which can enable me to state the result

of the discussion.

On 22 August at Mathura (Muttra), the traditional birth-place of Lord Krishna, the day being the day of the festival of the birth of Lord Krishna, his idol was installed for worship in a temple near Idgham mosque. Some persons broke that idol. Following the incident about 60 houses and huts were looted and set on fire. Twenty-five persons were taken into custody by the Police; and processions and meetings, assembly of five or more persons and carrying of lethal weapons were banned and curfew was imposed on the city from 6 p.m. that day to 2 p.m. the next day, the immersion of the idol of Krishna being done by 12 noon. The procession of the Jan Sangh organized for the evening of 22nd was dispersed and a meeting which the State Minister for Irrigation was scheduled to address that evening was postponed (*Times of India*, 23-8-'54)! With all this the issue of *The Times of India* for 24th reported that curfew which ended at 2 p.m. was reimposed at 4 p.m. to be in force till 7 a.m. next morning and that 164 persons were arrested. Of the arrested persons, 190 were convicted and sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment, or fine or both.

Only a week after the above riot and only ten days after the hoisting of Pakistani national flag at Hyderabad the neighbouring Gulbarga, the town known for its spacious mosque of the 14th century (A.D. 1367), was the scene of a similar incident on 29 August. The Pakistani national flag in this case was more provokingly used, combining in the action both political and religious outrage. The flag was hoisted over a temple of Ganesh, whose annual festival, celebrated with great eclat in Maharashtra, falls about that time of the year. As a protest against the double sacrilege a procession was taken out. While the processionists were being exhorted to keep calm some shops were set on fire. Panic resulting, curfew was imposed from 4 p.m. till dawn the next day, and meetings and assembly of more than 5 persons were banned. On 29 August, however, at 8 a.m. an 18-hour curfew from 12 noon to 6 a.m. the next day was imposed. And the report assured that precautionary measures were taken not only in Hyderabad and Secunderabad but also throughout the State (*Times of India*, 30-8-'54).

On 28 August the Magistrate of Mehsana district, Gujarat, promulgated an order banning *Tazia* (Taboot) processions during Moharrum, without prior permission of the Government, in the entire district, as such processions had caused communal tension in the past (*Times of India*, 30-8-'54).

On 16 October communal trouble had occurred at Manulia and Fatehpur in Muzaffarpur district in Bihar. On 26 the Government imposed a collective fine of Rs. 20,815 on the Hindu residents of the seven villages in the district, i.e., Arabia, Bella, Bhutahi, Bisanapur, Dostia, Fulkaha and Sarwarpur (*Times of India*, 28-10-'54).

At Bhopal during the Holi festival, the festival of lighting a fire in token of burning evil and demoniac influences in traditional mythology and prac-

tice accompanied by some kind of mild saturnalia falling early in April, some persons, evidently Muslims, had managed to throw bones in the Holi fire, thus defiling the sacred fire in the eyes of the Hindus. Twice thereafter some idols in a temple were defiled by some persons. The Hindu Mahasabha had given a call for a general strike, "hartal" as it is termed in Indian idiom, to protest against "the leniency shown by the authorities" towards the perpetrators of the sacrilegious acts. The organization had also decided to take out a procession and make a demonstration before the residences of the Chief Commissioner, the head executive, and the Chief Minister of the State. Early in the morning a processionist asking a shop-owner in Ibrahimपुरa, whose religious affiliation though not mentioned in the news may be presumed to be Muslim, to close it, an altercation arose. And soon soda water bottles, "lathis" and bamboos began to be hurled or flourished. As the procession reached the locality called Budhwara a shower of brickbats hailed the processionists. A Police officer intending to prevent further deterioration in the situation fired with his pistol ten rounds in the air. The bulk of the processionists dispersed but about 150 persons continued to proceed on their way to the Chief Commissioner's residence. They were stopped by the police at a certain spot before they could reach their destination and the magistrate proclaimed the usual banning order. Thereupon the remnants of the procession quietly dispersed. A 12-hour curfew from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. was imposed on that day, 7 April, 1956. The press note stated that in the affair fifty persons, including five police officers and a journalist, were injured in the communal clash (*Times of India*, 8-4-'56).

The incident did not close to all intents and purposes. For the issue of *The Times of India* for 27 April featured as news the views of the Congress chief of the State about the genesis of the Bhopal communal trouble of 7th, adding *inter alia* the information, that trouble was tried to be fomented, in the interval, at Ujjain and three other places in the State. He assured that the trouble was averted through the vigilance of his organization and blamed the Bhopal people—he was there for two days inspecting the place and making his personal inquiries on the spot a fortnight before (*Times of India*, 13-4-'56)—for lack of vigilance. He was convinced apparently of "the growing manifestation of communalism in the State" to counteract which his organization was to meet on 28th and "prepare a programme to curb this tendency".

His views on the genesis of the trouble—it was an old woman, evidently Muslim, who had thrown the bone in the Holi fire—that some communalists and persons who wanted to make propaganda against India in foreign countries were at its root may or may not be correct in its entirety, but the reply of the Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs on 3 May to a member of the Loka Sabha in Delhi, asking a leading question on the basis of his private information whether a radio transmitter transmitting secret

messages to Pakistan regarding the communal trouble had been seized by the police and whether any of the Pakistan nationals, who were in Bhopal on temporary permits, had been arrested for participating in the trouble, raises a presumption in its favour. The reply stated that a transmitter was seized from the premises of a local radio-dealer's shop and that the dealer was arrested and the matter was under investigation. He added that 5 Pakistan nationals had been arrested in connection with the communal clash. Though the radio-dealer's religious affiliation is not mentioned there is hardly any reason to believe that he was a non-Muslim. As to the end of all these arrests and investigations my file is silent and I shall leave the topic.

On 30 May, Sholapur figured in the news with the rival claims to a shrine at Bahrampur in Akalkot taluka made by the two communities, Hindus and Muslims, for 3 years past, coming to a head, and the Magistrate closing the premises for the whole month, it being the period of the celebration of the annual festival.

In September, there was a spate of Hindu-Muslim riots in Uttar Pradesh in the wake of a week long agitation over a publication of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, alleged to contain insulting references to Prophet Mohammed, Orai in Jhansi Division, Moradabad, and Aligarh figuring in the papers. The death roll in the first two districts was 11 on 8 September; and about 46 persons were lying in hospitals with stab wounds. In Moradabad district the arrests totalled 300 till 9th. In Aligarh, the University took the lead in militant demonstrations against the book and evoked counter-demonstration by way of a procession. The processionists received brickbats leading to serious disturbances in which arson as usual figured. Curfew was imposed, 150 persons were arrested, and special armed police were drafted from Mathura and Agra (*Times of India*, 17-9-'56).

Further information about Aligarh and other disturbances is not available in my file except that in Moradabad educational institutions were ordered on the 10th, by the Magistrate, to remain closed for "a further period of seven days", and that in Agra the usual precautionary prohibitions were extended for "a further period of one month" (*Times of India*, 19-9-'56).

Only one protest demonstration from one centre against the "communal attitude" of Muslims towards the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan book whose author was an American is represented in the cuttings. And that comes from Varanasi (Banaras). The educational institutions and shops of the place remained closed on the 10th in that demonstration. The Magistrate duly issued banning orders against processions and meetings. (*Times of India*, 11-9-'56). Nothing further was reported.

Jabalpur, which was to be so notorious in 1961, figures in the riots of September 1956, communal clashes having broken out there on 13th, consequent on a demonstration through closing of shops in protest against



damage to an idol of Ganapati, the elephant-headed god, installed for the annual festival in Mohalla Motinala the previous night. Six persons were injured in the clash in Mohalla Gohalpur and 3 houses were set on fire. Immediately the usual banning orders were promulgated and curfew was imposed from 7 p.m. to 6 a.m. More than 50 persons were arrested. Yet about 500 students carrying black flags marched through the bazaars of the town in defiance of the banning orders. The Deputy Commissioner of Jabalpur in his official communique stated: "Although tension prevails in the city, vigilant and strict steps taken by the authorities have restored confidence among the citizens" (*Times of India*, 14-9-'56).

The issue of *The Times of India* for 15th, however, flashed the news that on the previous day fresh communal clashes occurring at the place had resulted in four persons being killed and several others being injured. About 500 persons were by then rounded up, the dusk-to-dawn curfew was extended in some parts into an 18-hour one from 2-30 p.m. on 14 September. Members of the Muslim community—referred to in the news columns as the minority community—from the troubled area of the city were moved to safer areas, army personnel was alerted and high army officials discussed the situation with the police authorities. In spite of all this, a minor clash in which 9 persons were injured, cases of stray arson, and a knife attack occurred on 15th and 300 persons were arrested. In one area while the police were dispersing a crowd with tear-gas three rounds of gun-fire were fired from one of the houses. The dusk-to-dawn curfew was continued for the third night in succession. The total number of the dead in the three-day disturbances was seven (*Times of India*, 16-9-'56). Even then 16 September witnessed two cases of arson and looting. The number of dead was increased by one, the total number of the injured being 50. Curfew was relaxed on 16th. Those persons who had taken shelter in the police buildings were returning to their homes (*Times of India*, 17-9-'56).

Bhopal and Satna 32 miles from Rewa, in the same State, and Khamgaon in Buldhana district of the C.P. showed repercussions of the indignation of the Muslims against the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan book. In Bhopal and Satna, an insult, evidently by some Muslims—whether a Muslim organization was involved is not clear from the news-feature—to the *Bhagavadgita* evoked a protest demonstration from the Hindus of the place. In both places students made protest demonstrations. In Satna some shops were looted and a few houses were set on fire. The students raised slogans demanding action against "Pakistani agents" and against the persons responsible for the insult offered to the *Gita*. About 30 persons were arrested. In Bhopal there was a further complication as a procession to protest against the desecration of an idol of Ganesh at Jabalpur was organized, as Bhopal was the scene of a communal riot only in April 1956. There was the usual ban against processions and meetings. Fifteen persons were arrested under it. The entire business activity of the city was at a standstill at least on

17th (*Times of India*, 18 and 19-9-'56).

The Khamgaon riots started on 18th as a result of an attack on a Ganapati procession before a mosque by a crowd of about 500 persons, presumably Muslims, some of whom were armed with spears and daggers. In the disturbances that followed some shops and huts were set on fire. Usual banning orders were immediately promulgated and a dusk-to-dawn curfew was imposed. *The Times of India* issue of 20th reported that five persons had died of the injuries received in the disturbances and about 60 others were evidently out of danger. The police, who had already arrested 186 persons were reinforced with personnel from Akola and Nagpur. The number of shops looted and set on fire turned out to be about 20. The news-serviceman's letter in the next day's issue mentions the rising tide of communal ill-will in Madhya Pradesh and refers to disturbances in Katni, a cement centre, and other places of the State.

In Santhal Parganas where Hindu-Santhal clashes used to occur in 19th century and in the first two decades of 20th century, there was a Muslim-Santhal clash perhaps for the first time—eight years later it was to be involved in one of the most serious Muslim-non-Muslim conflicts of India—in October 1956. *The Times of India* of 23 October carried the news that on 16 October a procession carrying six images of the goddess Durga was attacked near a mosque in Sahebganj sub-division. In the disturbances 5 persons were killed and 7 rather seriously injured. The latter had to be removed to the Patna Medical College.

Only 3 disturbances in 1957 are represented in my cuttings. Once again a tribal district of Bihar, Hazaribhag, reported a fracas between some students and a Muharram procession, ending in serious injuries to two students and ordinary injuries to three other students (*Times of India*, 6-8-'57). Three months earlier on 5 May, at Belgaum, a procession of the Hindus with music, having declined to stop its music before a mosque received "lathis" flung at it from the first floor of a building adjoining the mosque. The report of the incident which resulted in injuries to 22 processionists spreading in the town led to some shops being attacked evidently for loot and to four knife-stabs. A 72-hour curfew was imposed on some parts of the town and the trouble seems to have died down.

Chopda in Jalgaon district was a scene of a riot, in which it appears the combatants were Hindus and the police, the latter in pursuit of social peace having cordoned off a particular road passing by a Muslim *dargah* and a mosque to prevent the Ganapati procession passing that way. The disturbances took place on 1 September 1957. Their echoes—pleasant surprise to the present writer that the cases were followed by newspaper reporters with such persistence—were heard in the court of the Additional Sessions Judge of Jalgaon in May 1958 in the form of Chopda Rioting and Arson cases. The prosecution had put up 33 persons as the accused offenders, the majority of whom were tradesmen, and in another suit, 11 persons

charged with the offence of setting fire to a timber depot and of causing a damage of Rs. 44,000. The Judge acquitted all the accused in both the cases, remarking that the evidence led against them by the prosecution was "worthless" (*Times of India*, 26-5-'58).

At Dhulia in Maharashtra, the chief town of the sister-district which has Jalgaon as its district-centre, it appears that in connection with a marriage feast in a house in the Mullawada locality of the town there was "unauthorized" cow slaughter on 8 September 1958. The police having been informed of it investigated the matter and filed a case under the Bombay Animal Preservation Act and posted policemen at all "strategic" (!) points in the locality. The next day the District Magistrate convened a meeting of the "local leaders of both the communities (Hindus and Muslims)". At the meeting it was resolved that no strike, "hartal", for which a call was already given by the Hindu leaders, should be observed and usual activity should be allowed to go on. Though this resolution was carried out and apparent peace settled on the town "police precautions were maintained", and the District Superintendent of Police himself went round to supervise the steps taken (*Times of India*, 12-9-'58). On 10 September processions—we are not told by whom, Hindus or Muslims, and for what purpose—were taken out from various localities. At 1 p.m. the processionists indulged in stone-throwing in Mullawada locality. This led to the breaking open and looting of a few shops in the town. The police, trying to prevent arson and looting, were stoned and were compelled to use tear-gas and make mild "lathi" charges. The banning provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code were immediately applied and curfew was imposed from 5 p.m. for 48 hours. During the disturbances 23 persons received minor injuries (*Times of India*, 26-9-'58).

Within a week, on the occasion of the annual Ganapati festival on the 16 September at Yeola, a famous old centre for embroidered cloth and saris, 16 miles from Manmad in Nasik district, there was a more serious flare-up accompanied by a more rigorous and evidently irresponsible handling of it by the local police, giving rise to a debate in the State Assembly reported at length in the issue of *The Times of India* for 2 October 1958. The Muslims of a particular locality objected to a procession, carrying an idol of Ganapati for installation on 16th, passing by the route in that locality and a clash ensued in which stones and sticks were used. The police that appeared on the scene, it appears from the news, opened fire without much ado to disperse the crowds. In the melee a police-officer was reported to have been stabbed and one person was killed apparently by police-fire. The usual prohibitory order was issued to be in force for the ten days of the Ganapati festival, making the celebration of it in any socially significant form an utter impossibility! There is nothing in the news about further deterioration in the situation (*Times of India*, 17-9-'58). The next day's issue of *The Times of India*, however, reported a serious turn in the situa-

tion in the afternoon of 17th, indicated by arson and looting, with about half a dozen houses being set on fire. The District Collector and the District Police Superintendent arrived in the town. Curfew was again imposed as from 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. the next morning and was repeated on 18th. Thirty-five persons were taken into custody. The damage to property on 17th was estimated to be Rs. 10,000 (*Times of India*, 18 & 19-9-'58). Almost a month after this news we read that representatives of the Hindu and Muslim communities of Yeola in a meeting agreed that processions could be taken out in the vicinity (i.e., by or in front of?) mosques at all hours except during Namaz. There is no specification of Namaz in the resolution reported. Following the decision a procession of Balaji—occasion, festival not indicated—was taken out in the town, evidently to establish the acceptance of the right! The meeting “also appointed a committee to arrange for compensation to the victims of the disturbances and to take steps to persuade those who left the town after the communal riots to return to their homes” (*Times of India*, 16-10-'58).

In October, Bagalkot in Bijapur district became the scene of a purely hate-conflict divested of the accompaniment or the camouflage of a religious festival or practice. On 26 October, a procession of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh volunteers—nss, as the organization is called in short, is an organization which has a pronouncedly Hindu view and drills its members for hardy, and if necessary militant, group action—was stoned near the Panka Masjid and some of the volunteers received injuries, and immediately reacted with violent action, looting shops and burning vehicles and damaging the mosque. The police had to open fire more than once, killing some people and injuring many more according to unconfirmed reports. Prohibitory orders were issued. Police reinforcements were rushed from Hubli and both the District Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police encamped at Bagalkot. The curfew order was in force for two nights at least and even the Commissioner of the Division and the Deputy Inspector General of Police rushed to the place on 28th and armed police moved about the streets, which but for them appeared deserted on that day. “No visitor is allowed into the town without a permit and police patrols are guarding all approaches to the town”! The only persons reported as having been arrested by the police were two pleaders: one being Dr Apte and the other Mr G. S. Kulkarni (*Times of India* 28 & 29-10-'58). In the Mysore Assembly the Chief Minister of the State, incited to make a statement by the tabling of two adjournment motions, stated that the riot had taken place on 28th and that it was the nss procession that started the stone-throwing, the stones being aimed at the mosque. He further informed the house that two mosques nearby the “Panka Masjid” were burnt down, the “Panka Masjid” itself suffering only damage (*Times of India*, 31-10-'58)!

March of 1959 with its Holi festival brought in communal riots at Luck-

now and Bhopal, those of the latter place being serious. At Lucknow in one of the bazaars a group of Holi revellers sprinkled coloured water and powder on a mixed crowd. It appears the crowd included Muslims who objected to the action of the revellers. A quarrel ensuing soon took the proportions of a communal riot, the Magistrate on duty finding it necessary to order the police to open fire to disperse the crowds and stop the disturbance. Four persons were injured by police fire and 46 persons were arrested. Next day a few assaults occurred in the area which was the scene of the previous day's disturbance. Banning orders were promulgated in some of the localities, likely to turn into trouble spots (*Times of India*, 26 & 27-3-59). As nothing further was apparently reported, the affair must be taken to have subsided into normalcy.

On 29 March the Rangapanchami or the "Colour-fifth Day" of the Holi festival, at Bhopal, the scene of communal riots more than once in the previous 5 years, early in the day at about 9.30 a.m., "a minor accident" resulting in injuries to some persons occurred in a locality known as Mangalwara. When later the colour-revelling procession reached Budhawara, the spot notorious for riots, about midday, the local residents, Muslims, stoned the processionists who became restive and broke out in violence. The police, who it appears were accompanying the procession, fired 50 tear-gas squibs to disperse the crowds. In the melee some shops were damaged and the window-panes of a mosque in the locality were broken. The next day after the midday prayers of the Muslims trouble started in right earnest, some of the praying devotees coming out and breaking open and firing shops, a printing press being totally burnt down. The police tried to meet the situation only with the use of tear-gas squibs. In the general disturbances which soon developed two sub-inspectors of police and one constable are reported to have fired at "violent mobs". Usual banning orders were promulgated and curfew was imposed as operative between 7 p.m. and 5 a.m., and over 500 persons were "rounded up". The Governor accompanied by his A.D.C., and the Chief Minister of the State separately toured the affected localities and visited the hospitals where the injured—they appear to have been more than 80 persons, six with stab-wounds and the rest with stone-injuries—were all being attended to. The next day, 31st, again there was trouble and two persons died of stab-wounds. The curfew from 7 p.m. to 5 a.m. was imposed on the whole of the municipal area. In the Mangalwara locality the police search party recovered from some of the houses some "lathis", spears and daggers. The total number of lethal weapons discovered and seized in the searches was authoritatively stated in the Vidhan Sabha of the State to be 175. Of these 65 were recovered from a mosque. During the day, 27 persons received injuries and were treated in the hospitals, nine of them being admitted as indoor patients (*Times of India*, 30 and 31-3- and 1-4-59). My collection of cuttings does not contain any that may enable us to visualize the end

of the violent disturbances. But that they were serious there is no doubt. Their echoes are loudly heard in the beginning of June in the Madhya Pradesh newsletter appearing in the *Times of India* issue of 1 June 1959. The question of compensation had occupied the thoughts of the Government of the State in view of the inflated claims put up and the repercussions of the action on the policy to be followed in respect of the Jain-Hindu fracas at Jabalpur on 19 February. The newsletter is eloquent on the reverberating repercussions of the Bhopal riots as it reads: "Even two months after the incidents, statements, counter-statements and resolutions are being issued and adopted, in an attempt to probe the real cause of the trouble." Though the probing went on, perhaps further, too, I am not aware of any "real cause" having been pin-pointed; and if I may say so there was no serious attempt made by Government to unearth the cause or causes. No probing of such an event as a communal riot which is not carried out by an impartial committee working on the authority of the Government can possibly result in discovering the real cause or causes of its occurrence.

That the rancour was rankling somewhere is clear from a news item appearing in the issue of the *Times of India* for 16 July, 1959. It informs the readers that a particular Hindu temple situated in an isolated spot near Bhopal was discovered on the morning of 11 July in a desecrated and broken condition!

Ramnnavami in April produced a serious communal riot at Sitamarhi in Muzaffarpur District, North Bihar, on 17th. The trouble flared up at the fair, on news having been circulated that a cow was slaughtered, and led to a stampede causing minor injuries to many. Nine persons were killed and several were injured in the clash that occurred between Hindus and Muslims as a consequence. In Akhta village nearby on 19th night some houses were set on fire by rival groups. Four persons were killed in the police firing. Six charred bodies were reported to have been recovered from the burnt houses. The total number of dead upto 22nd was put at 25. Usual prohibitory orders were promulgated for the whole district. The riots created echoes till at least the 14th of the next month. On that day, the Chief Minister of Bihar, as the situation in all the villages had returned to normal, addressed there a meeting of officials and non-officials engaged in relief work. He revealed that the houses of 535 families had been burnt in the village of Akhta alone and that 16 persons had died, and 29 others had received injuries. In Sitamarhi 14 persons had died and 668 had received injuries. House-building grants had been given to all except 8 families, 5 of which declined to take relief and 3 had not returned (*Times of India*, 18 and 23-4 and 11 and 15-5-'59).

In January 1960 there was a fracas at Hubli in Dharwar District on 9th, necessitating the promulgation of the prohibitory orders. However peace seems to have settled down soon, as the news reported in the issues of

*The Times of India* for the 11th and the 12th show. About six weeks after this, Dhulia, where there were riots earlier, found itself disturbed, several persons being injured and a number of shops being looted in the upsurge of the people's passions on the discovery of an idol of Maruti, disfigured by someone. Prompt promulgation of the prohibitory orders followed. The affair seems to have been rather mild (*Times of India*, 26-2-'60).

On 8 June, at Vidisha near Bhopal a procession taken out by the Hindu Mahasabha and the Jana Saugha to demonstrate against the police and the civil authorities permitting the Muslims to claim an old monument known as Vijaya Mandir as their own, is said to have indulged in stone-throwing at the police. Later, on return journey the processionists are said to have stoned some houses. The usual prohibitory orders were immediately promulgated (*Times of India*, 10-6-60).

In September 1960 the occasion of the Ramlila procession was marred by a serious incident. On 17th night a bomb was hurled at a procession which was passing by Jama Masjid in Ferozabad, about 35 miles from Agra, in front of the mosque. In the disturbances following the sacrilegious violence more than 60 persons were injured and stabbing cases followed. The District Magistrate and other high officials rushed to the scene and took into custody 38 people including the Imam and some trustees of the Masjid. The news item contains the interesting and instructive information, not provided by my cuttings, that a month earlier, i.e., on 12 August a communal disturbance had occurred on the exact spot where the bomb was thrown and that the police had opened fire on the violent mob. It is likely that the Muslims had then suffered casualties both through the fire of the police and the "lathis" of the Hindus and they decided to avenge themselves in this manner, a bomb-burst and the consequent confusion enabling them to see that an appropriate number of Hindus had paid for their brethren's doings in August!

Next morning, i.e., on 18 September 1960 a dozen stabbing cases were reported and the authorities rushed a battalion of the Provincial Armed Constabulary to assist the police. They were placed at various "strategic points"! Yet on 19th seven persons were reported to have been stabbed and some shops and houses set on fire. Despite the prohibitory orders and the curfew, passersby found themselves attacked, though armed police were reported as patrolling the city in gun-carriages. Ninety-two persons had been already arrested by 9 p.m. on the previous day. The situation was thought to be so grave that armed police were employed to guard the railway track between Tundla and Shikohabad stations. Yet on 20th morning one person was fatally stabbed and another was thrown out of running train near Ferozabad and four bodies—corpses?—bearing stab wounds were reported as recovered by the police the previous day. Nearly 100 persons were taken into custody by 21st.

The writer of the Current Topics columns of *The Times of India* in its

issue of 21 September 1960 wrote:

Are we never to see the end of communal violence in this country? The incidents in Ferozabad conform to a pattern which is as familiar as it is sickening. A Hindu procession playing music passes by a mosque and violence erupts. This is the beginning of a grim chain reaction. In Ferozabad on Sunday there was only a slight but *significant* \* variation in the pattern. A bomb was hurled at the passing procession. This fact suggests that the violence was not spontaneous but premeditated. . . . People going about their business peacefully continue to be attacked with knives solely because they profess a religious faith other than that of the assailant.

The news brought in on 22nd revealed that by 20th as many as 197 persons were arrested. The previous day's news had revealed that the bomb claimed six dead and 40 injured. Of the latter 18 were hospitalized. On 21st the situation was said to be steadily improving and the curfew was slackened in the morning to enable people to buy provisions. A punitive tax ranging from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 100,000 was reported as having been levied—I wonder if any was collected—to be realized from the resident of the Mohallas "where people violate the curfew and indulge in communal disturbances" (*Times of India*, 19, 20, 21 and 22-9-'60). The echoes of these communal riots are heard in the issue of *The Times of India* for 1 October, in the news flashing the promulgation of prohibitory orders on 29 September in the city of Agra.

In Saharanpur, U.P., on 22 September 1960 there was some trouble in connection with the Ramalila procession—what it was is not stated in the news—and the police lathi-charged it. The District Magistrate stated that in that fracas "21 police personnel, three deputy superintendents of police and two magistrates on duty" were injured. Small wonder that he issued the usual prohibitory orders. The people, however, according to the news resolved to break the orders and organize a "hartal", strike, of shopkeepers against the lathi charge of 22nd; and the issue of the *Times of India* for 26th brought the news that on 24th, 28 persons were arrested for defiance of the orders.

1961 proved to be one of the worst, perhaps the worst, year of communal trouble since 1949. It began with a particularly shocking, premeditated, revengeful and barbarous rape of a college girl, by name Usha Bhargava, of a Brahmin family as the name makes it out, by some Moslem youths—that Miss Bhargava in her declaration made even while dying with shock and burns could name them raises a presumption that they were college youths—in her house at night on 3rd February. Miss Bhargava who was

\* Italics mine.



living with her father in Jabalpur was all alone in the house, her father having gone to Allahabad on business, when she was surprised by these Muslims at night forcefully entering the house. At the point of a knife they forced her to yield herself to them and raped her. Immediately on their departure Miss Bhargava, in utter shame and horror and out of self-respect, natural to most Hindu girls, soaked herself in kerosene oil and lighted her dress. The burning kerosene-soaked clothes sent out clouds of smoke and attracted some neighbours to the place and she was taken to a hospital. There in her dying declaration she named the Muslims who had perpetrated this shockingly barbarous act on her.

On 4 February, there was a complete 'hartal', strike, in the form of closure, by shop-keepers and parades of angry students demanding stern action against "some persons alleged to have ravished" the girl went about the city. Disturbances in the form of looting of shops and setting fire to them in three or four bazaars of the city followed or accompanied these demonstrations. Curfew was imposed; the usual prohibitory orders were issued; the police-force was reinforced, even army units were called out to patrol the affected areas and armed guards were ordered to be posted at all "strategic points in the city". The District Magistrate called "an urgent meeting of prominent citizens to discuss the situation and devise concerted measures for the maintenance of peace". Though so much was being done and already done, the evening brought the report of gun-fire from one of the houses in one of the affected areas. A First-Class Magistrate of Jabalpur immediately raided the house and arrested an inmate with a gun. The religio-ethnic-cultural affiliation of the person is not available in the news, which tells us that the police van moving away with the arrested person was greeted with brickbats by a crowd in the locality resulting in some injury to the Magistrate! The front page of the issue of *The Times of India* of 5 February which flashed the report bore in very large letters the half-page-heading "Curfew Imposed on Jabalpur/Riots and Arson in City Follow Alleged Rape".

From 5 February the Jabalpur communal riots continued to keep their importance as a news item, evoked reaction elsewhere and reverberated in other ways till 23 March more or less regularly. And the echoes had not died down completely even so late as 22 September 1961, *The Times of India* issue of that date furnishing us with the information that the Chief Minister of the State, who was no other than Dr Katju, who was at one time a Home Minister of the Union Government, and a close relative of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, told the Vidhan Sabha of the State that in the communal disturbances in Jabalpur, Saugor, Narsinghpur and other places [Damoh, Gadarwara, Kareli, and Katni, the cement centre] in the State the loss of property was estimated at Rs. 11,58,000. I say "had not completely died down" because the criminal cases against the perpetrators of the rape were not known to have ended or reported to have done so. The one-man com-

mission of inquiry constituted by Justice Sheodayal Shrivastava, appointed early in July, had done its part in pulling a cover over the embers of the conflagration by deciding to conduct its proceedings *in camera* and stifling their probable or possible echoes.

In the issue of *The Times of India* for 6 February 1961 the Collector of Jabalpur's authoritative statement on the occurrences of 4th contained the information that 94 persons including 58 bad characters were taken into custody and 36 persons were arrested on charges of defying the curfew and contravening the bans. Dusk-to-dawn curfew was imposed for the second day on 5th; but the Army called out on 4th was withdrawn "following an improvement in the situation which was officially described" on the night of 5th as under "complete control". The arrests and rounding up of bad characters had gone on for the second day and the total had come to 272 and 89 respectively. Thirty-one cases of the injured were in hospitals and two had died till then. "A peace committee of local leaders and prominent citizens with the Mayor of Jabalpur as its president was formed and it had issued its appeal for peace. At the same time there had begun indications of the spread of the communal virus in the country around Jabalpur, heralded by an assault in the village of Pangar about 7 miles from Jabalpur.

6th February was reported as seeing "riot-torn Jabalpur" returning to normalcy with most educational institutions, shops and business houses and Government offices functioning as usual. No case of violence was reported. Curfew was slackened so as to make it operative from 9 p.m. instead of the dusk. News however had reached Jabalpur that the incidents had created "tension" in Katni, Pangar, Patan and Sihora. The tension at Sihora was a reaction to the arrival there of the bodies of two victims of the riots at Jabalpur for post-mortem examination, students and citizens having taken out a procession and held a meeting in demonstration evidently by the Hindu section (*Times of India*, 7-2-61). Late on 7th night in Jabalpur itself there was recrudescence of trouble which was so serious that not only had the police to open fire twice but also was the Army recalled to help them keep peace and order. Clashes were reported from at least 3 localities in the town; and all the fire engines of the Municipality were in action dealing with arson (*Times of India*, 8-2-61).

On 8th there were six adjournment motions in the Vidhan Sabha of the State but they were disallowed; and the Chief Minister informed the House that troops were patrolling the town and that policemen were the target of violence, several of them being injured. That evening a 36-hour curfew was imposed on the city. Acid bottle was one of the new missiles in the armoury of the violent crowds, being used against the police. Arms and ammunition were recovered, from the rioters which "gave rise to the impression in Government circles that political motives might be at work"—the logic of which impression is rather mysterious and not revealed:

Of the 3 cases of stabbing of the day two had died, the survivor himself having a dagger on him.

On 8th disturbances occurred also at Patan, 19 miles from Jabalpur and a prohibitory order was promulgated.

The news-serviceman of *The Times of India* having sent a detailed note on the occurrences of 7th night and 8th, the next day's issue of the paper carried a heading in large letters on its front page, about one-third of its breadth, which read: "12 killed and 38 injured in Jabalpur Riots/36-hours Curfew: Situation tense/308 Persons so far Rounded up". In the news report itself the previous night's (7th) incidents were described as "pre-planned and prearranged" and the situation of the 8th as "grave" with "tension mounting". The District Magistrate in his press note of 8th stated that several incidents of arson were reported, and that in a number of searches "a large number of lethal weapons were recovered". The news reported that shots were fired from one religious place where some miscreants had gathered (*Times of India*, 9-2-'61).

The issue of *The Times of India* for 10 February 1961 bore, in equally large proportionate space and prominent place, a heading which proclaimed the earlier indication of the spread of the communal virus infection in the country, six towns of the State writhing in its grip. Cases of looting and arson were the main symptoms. The affected towns were Damoh, Gadarpura, Gotegaon, Kareli, Katni, Narsinghpur and Saugor. Of these Saugor was the worst affected; for there the army had to be called into action. The arson cases of Jabalpur on the 7th and the 8th are described as "quite extensive", justifying the description of the activity of the municipal fire-brigade made above. The Chief Minister of the State who was in Jabalpur on 9th issued a statement in which he described the Jabalpur situation as "under control" and instructed the district authorities "to deal firmly" with any situation arising within their jurisdiction as the "trouble appeared to be spreading in other areas".

On 10th the death roll of Jabalpur disturbances was counted as 20 and that of Saugor as 4. The police carried out further searches for hidden arms but did not report their findings. In both Jabalpur and Saugor curfew was again imposed at 10 a.m. with a break between 3 p.m. and 5 p.m. in the former place. Unofficial reports spoke of tension in Maghgaon, Raipur, Satna, and Seohra. At Madhavgar, a few miles from Katni, three students were assaulted with swords, one of whom died as the result (*Times of India*, 11-2-'61).

The most important news of the day (10th), however, that one comes across on 11th is the fact of Muslim editors of nine local Urdu newspapers and periodicals of Delhi in a joint statement demanding an inquiry by a High Court Judge into the riots at Jabalpur and other places in Madhya Pradesh. The signatories expressed concern over the riots "as authorities have failed to control them and maintain law and order". They demanded

that the administration in the troubled areas should be handed over to the Army and that compensation should be paid for the loss of life and property (*Times of India*, 11-2-'61).

*The Times of India* news-serviceman thus described the scene presented by Jabalpur on 11th February, i.e., after a whole week of communal riots:

Charred and burned houses and looted shops bore grim witness to the havoc caused by arsonists and hooligans. The damage was heaviest in residential areas like South Mellonigunj and the locality facing Hanumantal Tank where people of different communities live close together. There were very few houses which escaped the fury of the miscreants in South Mellonigunj. Destruction was almost complete in the Hanumantal locality.

In the last locality there were many people engaged in fireworks manufacture and their inflammable and explosive materials explain the wider extent of destruction. The correspondent narrates one specially encouraging and pleasant experience of the dismally horrifying riots. He was shown by the police officer accompanying him a house on National Highway No. 7 which was standing almost intact. It belonged to a Muslim gentleman and the rioters had once set fire to it but the neighbours who were Hindus gathered together and quenched the fire before it could do much harm!

At 5 p.m. the curfew was reimposed, to be in force till 6 a.m. next morning. The prohibitory orders were to continue for another week, though the number of persons taken into custody was over one thousand. Jabera, a town in Dandoh district about 60 miles from Jabalpur, had a bout of rioting on 11th causing the death of three persons. The number of total dead in the State as a result of these disturbances came to 31. Bhopal, too, showed signs of tension and panic on 11th, though the situation did not develop ugly aspects. The situation in all the disturbed towns of the State was stated to be peaceful.

At Bhopal the Working Committee of the Bhopal Vidyarthi Parishad (Students' Conference) at a meeting held on 10 February urged the State Government to institute judicial enquiry into stone-throwing and the firing on students in Jabalpur by the supporters of the people responsible for the alleged criminal assault on a college girl (*Times of India*, 12-2-'61).

On 12 February most of the families that had left their homes situated in the localities where houses were set on fire on 7 and 8 February are reported to have returned to their homes in Jabalpur. But in the same day's news from Jabalpur we read about a harrowingly callous incident that occurred in a village named Sarupa—its exact location in reference to any big town is not given. A big house in which at least four families

were living was set on fire by a group of miscreants from a neighbouring village. 15 persons were burnt alive in that conflagration! (*Times of India*, 13-2-'61).

In the issue of *The Times of India* for 18 February we have a summary of what happened in Congress circles and High Command in Delhi over the riots in Jabalpur and other towns of the Madhya Pradesh. The Congress Parliamentary Party's seven-man committee for the fostering of communal unity met on 17th at the instance of a number of Muslim M.P.'s led by Maulana Hafizur Rahman. At the meeting were present by special invitation Mr Shahnawaz Khan, Mr Abid Ali, Mr Jamal Khwaja and Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir. The meeting suggested that the officers immediately concerned with the administration in the State should be "strongly" dealt with. It at the same time pointed out that "those responsible for the criminal assault on a college girl, which was the direct cause of the tragedy should be punished". The meeting further opined that "if the police had taken immediate action against these criminals, the matter would not have assumed the proportions it ultimately did" (*Times of India*, 18-2-'61).

One case of stray assault was reported on 19 February and police patrolling on important roads and points continued, tension being in the air (*Times of India*, 20-2-'61). And the issue of *The Times of India* for 22 March 1961, i.e., about 7 weeks from the commencement of disturbances in Jabalpur, brought the news of disturbances in the village of Bhanwara in Patan Tahsil, 20 miles from Jabalpur. Sixteen people were arrested in connection with these disturbances and were kept in Jabalpur jail.

The next day's issue of the same paper brought a resume of the findings and recommendations of a four-man committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party consisting of Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Anwar Harvani, Sushila Nayyar and Surendra Mohan Ghosh, as a result of its on-the-spot inquiry into the Madhya Pradesh communal disturbances briefly narrated above. Two other reports by single members, one by the then Congress President Sanjiva Reddy, and the other by Indira Gandhi, perhaps in her capacity as the Chairman of the National Integration Committee, are also mentioned in the despatch without divulging their contents. The report blamed the local administration for lack of deep concern and of prompt measures to protect the interests of the 30,000 to 40,000 Muslims of Jabalpur. It further drew attention to the unofficial reports that "several hundred" Muslims had left Jabalpur during the riots for "safer places". It asked the Government to transfer [!] "some of the officers guilty of dereliction of duty". It urged speedy and effective rehabilitation of the victims of the riots, opining that "confidence will not return until members of the minority community [Muslims] are provided with houses—in cases of arson—and their means of livelihood, including tongas, sewing machines and other working implements, restored.

Among the long and reverberating echoes of this unprecedented and terrific chain of communal disturbances sparked off by a shockingly outrageous and barbarous act by some youths of the minority community may be mentioned the reaction it had in Maharashtra, because it is the only significantly integrative one, though not the earliest. The issue of *The Times of India* for 23 February reported that in Bombay at a meeting of its prominent citizens held in the chamber of the Chief Minister an influential committee was appointed to raise funds for the relief of "the Jabalpur riot victims". The six members including the chairman, the two secretaries and the treasurer were all the usual Congressmen and women of Bombay. It must be presumed that though the meeting is described as of "prominent citizens" of Bombay it was almost wholly or at least very preponderatingly a meeting of Congressmen. The signatories to the appeal to all citizens of Maharashtra and particularly to those of Bombay and other cities and towns of the State to discourage rumours and exaggerating reports of disturbances, not less than 25 in all, included among them quite a good number of prominent people of Bombay belonging to political parties other than the Congress.

About 15 months after the Jabalpur riots echoes of them were heard in the form of the judgment of the division bench of the Madhya Pradesh (Jabalpur) High Court delivered on 1 May 1962. In the disturbances of February 1961, 15 persons, including women and children were burnt in Sarpura village, 10 miles from Jabalpur. Eighteen persons were put up for trial. Nine of them were acquitted by the Sessions Judge and the rest were sentenced, one to death and the others to life imprisonment. These latter had appealed to the High Court. The judgment was wholly in favour of the sentenced, the High Court, not finding any trustworthy evidence implicating the accused, quashed the sentences and let off the accused prisoners.

Still more distant echoes of the February riots of Jabalpur were to be heard. Almost two years after the outrage which sparked off the terrific chain of communal riots, the *Times of India* issue of 14 January 1963, reported a judgment delivered by the division bench of the Madhya Pradesh High Court on 7 persons, evidently Hindus, who were convicted of committing or abetting criminal assault on a Muslim lass, the daughter of an aluminium article dealer on 4 February 1961, as an incident of looting and burning the shop of the man. Their Lordships in their judgment acquitted five of them and convicted and sentenced the remaining two, against whom alone independent evidence was available.

Late in the evening of 16 February, at about 9-30 p.m. in Daryaganj in Delhi, when a group of persons of one community were distributing alms in observance of its festival, members of another community began throwing stones at them which led to a clash between the two groups and subsequently to excitement and agitation, bringing on the spot group of angry

people. However, the incident appears to have surprisingly ended rather tamely.

At Palanpur in Gujarat on the discovery of animal bones in the precincts of a place of worship on 18 March "hartal", strike by closure of all business and other normal group activity, was observed. A black-flag demonstration was held at the Palanpur railway station on the arrival of the Governor of Gujarat for some official function in the district. The demonstrators shouted slogans demanding a ban on cow slaughter. Later a deputation waited on the Governor to lay before him its complaint against the desecration of the place of worship that had led to the strike. The Collector called a meeting of leading citizens of Palanpur and a peace committee was formed. No further report about Palanpur affair is traced in my cuttings and I must take it that the commotion soon subsided.

Within about a week of the dying echoes of the disturbances in the Madhya Pradesh,—whose capital, Bhopal, is a city with a strong Muslim element imbued with the tradition of ruling and dominance—radiating from Jabalpur, Uttar Pradesh was convulsed by communal riots. These received their impetus from Aligarh University, where between 1 and 3 October 1961, incidents occurred which for their novelty of approach and technique are almost as reprehensible as those of Jabalpur. The towns involved in this conflagration, which glowed for about 15 days, were: Aligarh, Amroha, Baghpat, Baraut, Bulandshahr, Chaudausi, Dehra Dun, Farukhabad, Gaziabad, Gorakhpur, Hapur, Kasganj, Khurja, Lucknow, Mathura, Meerut, Moradabad, Muzaffarnagar, Saharanpur, Sambal and Vrindavan.

Five years earlier, in 1956, there were somewhat similarly wide-spread disturbances in both the Uttar Pradesh and the Madhya Pradesh as narrated earlier. The starter in that year was Aligarh, and other places like Bhopal were epicentres. During the interval we are informed by *The Times of India* news-serviceman, in his special Uttar Pradesh Newsletter (17-10-61), that there had occurred "two major communal disturbances at Mau (Azamgarh) and Ferozabad". They were not considered politically significant as they had no relevance, or rather had only very distant relevance, to the General Elections. Like the 1956 disturbances, however, the 1961 ones, too, were timed almost on the eve of the General Elections. The news-serviceman reveals that the Home Minister of U.P. had, on 5 April 1961, stated in the Vidhan Sabha that "The State was facing a communal problem reminiscent of pre-Independence years" and that on 6 April the same august person charged, before the same highly responsible body, the Jana Sangh "with inciting communal violence". The same source vouchsafed the very reassuring attitude and resolve of the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, made public on the 9 August, that his Government would "crush" the Sangh by educating public opinion. Meanwhile, Sangh legislators continued to harp on what they described as the "danger to security"

cuttings.

What can be gathered from the brief news items appearing from time to time during the 10 days between the 2 and the 12 October is that on 1 October, the elections to the Students' Union Executive of Aligarh University, which were strenuously and bitterly canvassed on communal lines between the Muslim students and the Hindu students, were decided; and the Hindu section, forming 35 per cent of the students, was routed. A funeral procession of the effigies of the defeated candidates was taken out by the Muslim students late in the evening or early at night. There occurred some clashes between the two groups. Next day it appears the Hindu students took out a protest-demonstration in procession. At about midnight that day or the previous day some Muslim students entered the rooms of the Hindu students and beat up, in a barbarous manner, six of the leading ones, it appears (?). The rumour was spread that two Hindu students were killed, though it is more or less clear from the news items that there was no student casualty.

Newsletter of 4 October from Aligarh (*Times of India*, 5-10-'61) reported that in the disturbances that occurred in the various parts of the city on 3rd, 6 persons were killed and 43 injured and that Aligarh Muslim University was closed for 18 days from 4th. Much excitement, however, was reported as "still" prevailing in the Ziauddin Hostel and that students "belonging to one community [Hindus of course!] left the hostel" that morning. Yet the Vice-Chancellor of the University is reported to have said that "perfect harmony prevailed on the campus". In the Aligarh news of 5th (*Times of India*, 6-10-'61) Colonel Zaidi, confronting the Union Minister for Education, is reported to have felt ashamed that some students of one community in the Ziauddin Hostel should have assaulted students of another community when they were asleep. Both the Union Minister for Education and the Minister in the Union Ministry of Home Affairs are said to have "heard the students' version of the disturbances". The latter later told newsmen (*Times of India*, 7-10-'61) that he had submitted his report to the Prime Minister and assured them that "calm now prevailed in Aligarh". He told them further what appears to be the gist of his report, viz., that "the Aligarh incidents could 'perhaps have been avoided or ended had strong action been taken' by the university authorities both before and after the students' elections".

The District Magistrate in his press note of the 3rd night said:

Owing to the failure of the university authorities in taking prompt action against the delinquent students who had belaboured six Hindu students in the Ziauddin Hostel on the night of October 1, communal tension developed both in the city and the university area last night. This morning [3rd] in spite of an order under Section 144 Cr. P. C. and police reinforcements a mob of about 5000 persons— it is enlarged to



8000 persons in the next day's news service (*Times of India*, 5-10-'61)--tried to proceed from the city to the University area at 10. It was intercepted by the district authorities with the help of the police near the railway bridge and was forced back and dispersed after a show of force.

The press-note does not specify any casualty; nay it represents the dispersal as if it were a tame and almost quiet affair! But there must have been some casualties occurring in this "show of force" which must have got included in the total number for the day given above.

The press-note further informs us that one person was arrested with a "foreign made" gun. Some shops belonging to both the communities on the outskirts of the university were burnt. Curfew for 24 hours was imposed on the city and three battalions of the Armed Police Constabulary had arrived and were assigned duties in enforcement of "the full riot scheme".

Maulana Hafizur Rehman, Maulana Abdul Rehman, and Mr Ansar Harvani, all MP's had arrived in Aligarh on 4th as an on-the-spot-fact-finding committee. The facts, discovered by them, if any and if published, are not represented in my cuttings and I shall leave the committee with this mere mention.

It appears that the village of Kher, only 12 miles from Aligarh and Chandausi, about 50 miles from Aligarh and 18 miles from Moradabad were the first places to react to the Aligarh University incidents. In the former two persons were reported as having been stabbed on 3rd or 4th (?) (*Times of India*, 5-10-'61). In Chandausi, according to the press note of the District Magistrate, "incited by the students returning from Aligarh" about 1000 local students took out a procession as a protest against the Aligarh incident "about 10" in the morning on 4 October. The procession was treated to a "welcome" of showers of brickbats. This enraged the local population and in the disturbances "indiscriminate looting and burning" of shops got started.

At Meerut, too, the same was the case with this difference that there no student returning from Aligarh figures in the despatch. The reports from Agra, Hapur, and Mathura, too, of 5 October mentioned that students stayed away from their classes on the 4 and 5 October and took out processions, local students raising anti-Aligarh University slogans (*Times of India*, 6-10-'61). The report from Agra for 6th mentions an educational strike and that too with students marching through the streets with their protests. The shops, too, remained closed and the situation was considered to be so serious that police guards were placed in the neighbourhood of Jama Masjid. In Meerut troops were called out on 6th, where students defying the prohibitory orders had taken out a procession in the morning. At Gorakhpur about 800 students of the University tried to take out a procession but were held back within the University campus. Their meeting earlier had adopted a resolution condemning the attack on the Aligarh

University students "belonging to one community". On the same day at Hapur armed police "stood guard at strategic points in the town". Six shops were burnt and some persons were injured in the disturbances (*Times of India*, 7-10-'61).

On 7 October 1961 6 of the towns mentioned above as having shown the disturbance pattern, Agra, Bulandshahr, Dehra Dun, Khurja, Mathura, and Vrindavan, had the usual prohibitory orders promulgated (*Times of India*, 8-10-'61).

Aligarh figures in the news of 7th (*Times of India*, 8-10-'61) with the report of the conference of its District Magistrate with the pressmen giving the following particulars. As stated earlier the Ramalila celebrations remained suspended. Students were leaving for their homes; 289 persons were arrested for the breach of the curfew order and 20 for spreading false rumours. Twelve persons were killed and 53 injured. The University authorities expelled 2 students by name Badrul Islam and Iqbal Singh. The latter was taken into custody by the police in connection with a stabbing incident. The despatch further states that the local Bar Association resolved expressing concern over the revival of communalism at Aligarh through the encouragement of some teachers in the University (*Times of India*, 8-10-'61).

By 9 October the number of the dead and the injured in the communal disturbances at Meerut had risen to 13 and 25, respectively. On 8th the District Magistrate ordered the Army and the police to shoot offenders indulging in arson, loot or murder at sight; and mounted police were posted at "strategic points". Nearly 250 persons were rounded up and kept under heavy police guard. 300 other persons were already arrested for one reason or another. At Muzaffarnagar educational institutions were closed till 22 October, and prohibitory orders as well as curfew were promulgated. At Saharanpur in which district 130 persons were already under arrest the main Ramalila procession was taken out in the evening on 8th. In Moradabad district at Amroha, Chandausi, Moradabad and Sambal, altogether 170 persons were arrested (*Times of India*, 9-10-'61).

*The Times of India* issue of 12 October brought the news of the arrest of a Pakistani national and his brother at Mathura the previous day for spreading false rumours (*Times of India*, 12-10-'61).

On 10 October *The Times of India* featured its principal leader as "Aligarh and After". It lent support to the contention of the Chief Minister and the Home Minister of U.P. that the riots had some organization or organizers behind them and were not spontaneous. And as for the specific allegation that the organization or the organizers were "some political parties" it pertinently observed: "If there is evidence to support this belief, the State Government should prosecute the organizers even if it felt that it would not be expedient to do so with the general election round the corner." The remedy it suggested to meet the situation which it admit-

ted to be serious and dispelling all complacency was "to complete the formation of the National Integration Council so that it can meet and try to answer the challenge implicit in the events of the past week".

Apropos of the Aligarhi riots, the allegations that at least some teachers of the University were communal-minded and encouraged communalism, and the exhortation of *The Times of India* that the National Integration Council should be formed with the implication that it will meet the communal challenge, it is necessary to emphasize the following item of news in the "Indian News in Brief" column of the issue of that paper for 28 July: "Twenty prominent teachers of Aligarh Muslim University, in a statement, have suggested that a conference of intellectuals of all communities be held at an early date to devise ways and means of promoting emotional integration. The statement proposes that the conference should be held preferably in Delhi and that the initiative for holding it be taken by Mrs Indira Gandhi." Only two months after the issue of this very laudable, pious and you-do-the-job-instruction under the very nose of these twenty "prominent" stalwarts of "emotional integration" occurred an emotional upsurge a barbarous and shocking, to an educated man against fellow students of another community, the minority community at the University campus, among their educational and intellectual wards. This should indicate to us the nature and measure of the contribution such men as "the twenty prominent teachers" of Aligarh Muslim University could have made to the devising of an effective plan for communal harmony, emotional integration or national solidarity, undertaken by the National Integration Council which we know to have met before Aligarh started the communal riots!

I shall now turn back to the disturbances which occurred between those of Jabalpur in February and those of Aligarh in October.

From Gaya came the news that on the night of 3 March 1961, a procession of "holi"-revellers in the small village of Manikpur in Belaganj thana of the district about 13 miles from Gaya was fired upon by some persons and that the fire killed one person and wounded three others. Immediately on receipt of the news at Gaya, a contingent of 100 armed policemen was sent to the village. The persons alleged to have opened fire fled from the village and the district authorities issued orders for attaching the properties of the 15 absconders who were "wanted" in connection with the firing (*Times of India*, 5-3-61).

Moradabad, which figures in the history of communal riots off and on, was reported (*Times of India*, 20 and 21-3-61) to have had stray cases of assault and stabbing on 17 Friday and also the next day. It appears that on 19th, later in the day, the usual prohibitory orders operative for a fortnight were issued, and still later, (being late news) dusk-to-dawn curfew was also imposed as two persons were reported to have been killed and six others injured in the stabbing incidents of the day. By 21st, 114 persons

were arrested and though most of the shops were open armed police kept on patrolling.

For a slight change, the month of May brought into the picture of communal riots Jalna, a town in the South central region about 40 miles from Aurangabad. There were attempts at looting and arson in the town on 8 May and prohibitory orders, to be in force for a fortnight, were immediately issued by the Additional District Magistrate. One constable who was suspended in connection with the attempted incidents and two other persons in the same connection were arrested (*Times of India*, 10-5-'61).

Bhopal, which was in epicentre in the series started in Jabalpur in February and which figured in the news of 8 May (*Times of India*, 9-5-'61), because a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Bhopal District Jana Sangha took "strong exception" to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's speech in Bhopal made in April apropos of the February communal riots, dubbing it an "open interference" in the working of the judicial commission inquiring into the disturbances, figured in the news on 25th May. On the previous day twenty-five persons including the Chairman of the Central Parliamentary Board of the Hindu Mahasabha and the Vice-President of the Vidisha Municipal Board were taken into police custody at the town of Vidisha (Bhilsa) about 60 miles from Bhopal. The arrests were represented as a preventive measure in order to assure a peaceful celebration of the Muslim festival of Id on May 26. Prohibitory orders too were issued. The Madhya Pradesh unit of the Mahasabha in reply gave a call for general strike in Vidisha on May 25 and 26 as a protest against the arrests.

Vidisha (Bhilsa) and Bhopal figure again about two months after, in a more lurid light in the news items of 4 August. The communique issued by the Madhya Pradesh Government on the disturbances which occurred was abstracted in *The Times of India* issue of 5 October. A religious procession of Hindus was passing by a certain route which was the usual one. In the meanwhile "two leaders of another community happened to be passing along the route in a jeep". As they were held up by the procession they remonstrated with some of the processionists and a slight scuffle ensued. Immediately after there was a general closure of shops ("hartal"). A crowd, evidently of "another community" (Muslims) collected on the route of the procession a little ahead of it, as one can read between the lines. The police arrived on the spot; but the situation, we are told, grew serious with "vigorous stone-throwing" and the District Magistrate with the usual summary ritual ordered the police to fire in order to disperse the crowd. The dispersing crowd assaulted innocent persons on their way and "damaged" "a few small shops". Curfew was imposed from 8 p.m. to 6 a.m. on 5th. On 5th "vigilance" continued. Thirty-two persons were taken into police custody!

Aligarh begins, according to my cuttings, the communal clashes of 1962, communal tension having developed in Sikandra Rao town, 22 miles from

Aligarh on 13 March. Evidently there was the slaughter of a cow which brought in its wake closing of shops and stray cases of assaults. Usual prohibitory order was promulgated. Of the persons concerned in the cow slaughter only two could be arrested, about half a dozen others having absconded (*Times of India*, 13-3-'62). It is possible that the communal clash at the Holi-time in March in the Pazole police station area of Malda District in West Bengal occurred about the same time. But my collection of cuttings shows reference to it only on 3 April (*Times of India*, 4-4-'62). From Karachi the news came that the Deputy High Commissioner of Pakistan in Calcutta was instructed to seek the permission of the Government of India to tour those areas of Malda District where the communal riot was said to have occurred resulting allegedly in the deaths of nine Muslims.

Seven days after this news, Calcutta, was in the grip of communal tension and violence (*Times of India*, 12-4-'62). Agitation against the publication of a picture of Mohammed, the Prophet, in a book took a violent turn. A procession of 2,000 protestants clashed with some shopkeepers—of course must be Hindu shop-keepers—who would not heed the call for suspension of business made by the processionists. When the police arrived on the spot they were greeted with stone-throwing. One or two other similar demonstrations in other parts of the city with the same developments were also reported. The police arrested 150 demonstrators. Within a week of the Calcutta affair, Malda again figured in the news with dusk-to-dawn curfew imposed for three days from 16 April. Though there was some looting and arson there was no casualty (*Times of India*, 18 & 19-4-'62). It claimed attention of the Loka Sabha on 24 April where the Home Minister, Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri, informed the house, in reply to a question, that the situation in Malda was under control and that there was no truth in the allegation that Muslims of Malda district had migrated to East Pakistan (*Times of India*, 25-4-'62). Only two days previously the paper (*Times of India*, 23-4-'62) had reported the deaths of two persons and the injuries to four others and the burning of some houses in incidents in the village of Asrampur. The news item had informed the public that three Pakistani nationals were taken into custody in Malda for entering the district without valid passports. And it was only on 27th night that the dusk-to-dawn curfew in Malda town imposed on 16th was lifted. The news item from Calcutta dated 28 April (*Times of India*, 29-4-'62) which revealed this state of affairs contained the interesting little detail that about 200 persons had been arrested "during the past few days in connection with these incidents". It cannot be ascertained from the news whether the arrests were from Malda town or from the whole district, but the context suggests the former alternative. It is further noteworthy in view of the reply in the Loka Sabha that news from Calcutta of May 2, i.e., a whole fortnight after the start of the trouble in Malda, revealed that Army personnel was deployed for restoring confidence,—since when the news does

not state—and that it was still there and was expected to be “withdrawn shortly” (*Times of India*, 3-5-62). The Delhi news was concerned only with the assurance evidently to Pakistan, the world at large, and the Muslims in India, that there was no large-scale exodus of Muslims from Malda to Pakistan. At the same time the Dacca news revealed that Pakistani journalists had boycotted the reception held in honour of the Indian High Commissioner, “as a protest against the present anti-Muslim riots in West Bengal”.

On the day of the Delhi news, Nehru in his brief survey of current affairs made to the Parliamentary Consultative Committee is reported to have spoken about “the communal incidents in Malda in West Bengal and Dacca and Rajshahi in East Pakistan”. Evidently the Malda disturbances were linked up with those in Dacca and Rajshahi in East Pakistan and perhaps were only a reflex or a reaction!

Some incidents affecting the peace and harmony among the different communities of Cooch Bihar were incidentally referred to in the news from Calcutta of 18 May 1962 (*Times of India*, 19-5-62). Six days later, Agra witnessed a clash between “two communities” in its Masjid Tala area as a result of a quarrel and cuffing within a hotel. Soda-water bottles and brickbats flew about for half an hour and at least two pottery shops were looted and the contents damaged (*Times of India*, 25-5-62). The same day to the south at Mandasor, a famous early mediaeval centre about 140 miles from Indore, a communal clash starting from a dispute between two parties over a business transaction resulted in injuries to 12 persons and brought in 2 platoons of armed police (*Times of India*, 26-5-62).

A blatantly militant and contemptuous provocation by Muslims to the local Hindus of the village Pathrud in Marathwada—remember that this part of Maharashtra was under the dominion of the ex-Nizam of Hyderabad—figured in a written reply made by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra to a tabled question in the Assembly of the State and was reported in *The Times of India* issue of 5 July 1962. Six Muslims having entered the local Ganapati temple on 7 April removed the 3 idols, Ganapati, Mahadeo and Nandi, standing inside and threw them in a nearby well. Immediately thereafter about 11 other Muslims joined them and all of them offered their Islamic prayers inside the temple. Surprisingly there is no mention of any disturbance resulting from this outrageous action!

Next month the change of scene and comeback to the usual procedure, however, made up for this lack of fireworks in Marathwada. Bareilly, a trouble spot throughout history perhaps since Jehangir's time, reported a serious clash between Hindus and Muslims in the village of Jamantpur in the Baheri tahsil of the District on 24 August (*Times of India*, 28-8-62). The procession taken out in celebration of Krishna's birth-anniversary having found its usual route too slushy took an alternative route which passed by a locality inhabited by Muslims. The leader of that locality and his

son raised objection and hot words followed. Thereupon the processionists were pelted with brickbats and assaulted. The decorated seat of the idol of Krishna which was being carried was also damaged in the fray. People from the other end, the destination of the procession, on getting the news of the fracas went to the place and raiding some of the houses set them on fire, injuring several persons. The trouble is reported to have lasted only for 3 hours, 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., and yet there were five persons killed, 19 injured, several of them seriously.

September with its Ganapati festival brought a part of Maharashtra into the picture of riot news. At Karle, a village three miles from Ratnagiri, the place of the Collectorate, on September 3 a Ganapati procession, which had passed along a route at noon led to a communal fracas on its return by the same route which passes by a mosque. Trouble was previously apprehended and the police were ready. Yet a mild "lathi"-charge by itself was not adequate to disperse the unruly crowd and the police fired a few shots in the air. Eight persons were reported as having received injuries during the trouble. Surprisingly 6 of them happened to be police-constables (*Times of India*, 4-9-62)! Six days later in Ratnagiri town itself the immersion procession of Ganapati was taken out, though with a large crowd, under special precaution and adequate police arrangements including the usual prohibitory order (*Times of India*, 10-9-62). Two towns in Buldana district, Nagpur division, too, were affected by communal tension and its aftermath of damage to property. They were Malkapur and Khamgaon which figures more than once in our brief narration of the story of Hindu-Muslim clashes or riots. The press-note describes the clash as between two rival groups, though in the issue of *The Times of India* of 28 August 1963 it is stated that at Khamgaon the Ganapati festival of last year had created trouble. The usual prohibitory orders had to be kept in operation for over a fortnight from 13 September and the damage to property on one day in Khamgaon alone was estimated to be over Rs. 10,000 (*Times of India*, 17 and 23 September '62).

The communal clash of October in Kozhikode (Calicut) reported in *The Times of India* issue of 11 October 1962 may or may not be one between Hindus and Muslims as the news does not specify the communities involved.

In July 1963 Junagadh in Gujarat reported both strikes and stab-assaults as an aftermath of the criminal assault by two Muslim youths of 20 and 19 on a Hindu girl of 13 years in a solitary spot in the historic fort by the city known as Upperkot. The magistrate immediately, on July 12, promulgated the usual prohibitory orders for a whole week. The strike both of businessmen and of students continued the next day and at one spot the police had to use tear-gas to disperse the crowd. It appears that there were no further clashes. In one day's clash one man was stabbed to death and 5 received injuries (*Times of India*, 12 and 14 and 15 July 1963). Repercus-

sions of these events were recorded in the precautionary measures of prohibitory orders issued by the Police Commissioner of Ahmedabad.

At Islampur, Bahurghat (West Bengal) on 12 July the Muslim participants of a *Moharrum* procession attacked the police with "lathis" and other weapons, when the latter tried to prevent the processionists from taking it through a prohibited area (*Times of India*, 15-7-'63). This incident of course cannot be called a Hindu-Muslim disturbance but is a standard illustration of Hindu-Muslim tension and conflict and serves as a good eye-opener as to what the Muslims are capable of in fulfilment of their tension-stress.

The Ganapati festival of 1963 caused tension in Akota, a tahsil town in Akola district of Maharashtra, about 30 miles from Akola, and necessitated the posting of a strong police force in Khamgaon, another tahsil town of the district where the previous year's festival was marked by disturbances (*Times of India*, 28-8-'63). The tension turned into a serious riot at the trouble-spot of Hindu-Muslim conflict in Maharashtra, Malegaon, near Nasik, a stronghold of Muslim weavers who are fairly well-to-do and in large concentration. On 2 September when a procession taking Ganapati idols for immersion was passing by a mosque in Sardar Chowk bricks and soda water bottles were hurled on it. The irate processionists became a riotous mob and looted shops. The police—there were already 300 of them in the town at that time and 150 more were immediately asked to be rushed in—opened fire. In the disturbance and the fire 7 persons were killed and some 80 persons including 14 policemen were injured and about 25 shops were looted. Full curfew order was in operation for at least 2 days. The immersion which was abruptly interrupted on 2nd was completed on 4th and was over by 4.30 p.m., the curfew being lifted for a few hours. Though the participants numbered 3,500 they were under police protection. Among the 35 persons arrested was Mr Haroon Ansari, a Congress M.L.A. Educational institutions did not begin normal working till 10th (*Times of India*, 3, 4, 5 and 9 September 1963). Later the Government withdrew cases against the 4 persons, including Mr Ansari, which it had instituted (*Times of India*, 2-12-'63).

The year 1964 brought in perhaps the worst of Hindu-Muslim disturbances since 1952, not excepting even those of 1961. They were however sparked off, outside Kashmir, by the atrocities perpetrated on Hindus, Christians and Tribals in Eastern Pakistan, unlike those of 1961. The gravity of the situation may be gauged from the fact that my cuttings contain four editorials, these too leading editorials, of *The Times of India*, dated 13 January, 17 January, 28 March, and 2 April, all of which whether headed "Communal Harmony" or "Joint Action" or "Call to Sanity" or "Too Many Voices" bear on the same phenomenon, i.e., the fact of communal—Hindu-Muslim or Muslim-Christian or Tribal-Muslim—riots in Pakistan (East) and in India (Bharat).

In the last week of December 1963, it became known that the hair of



Mahommed, the Prophet, which was deposited in Hazratbal mosque in Srinagar was stolen. This discovery and news caused riots and disturbances in Srinagar which lasted over days paralysing life in Srinagar for fully 10 days. The way in which comments were being made in Pakistan over this unfortunate event, for the occurrence of which there was not a shred of evidence to implicate the Hindus of either Kashmir or any other part of India, led to such tension in Khulna and several other parts of East Pakistan that both in Khulna and Jessore districts murderous attacks on the Hindu minority accompanied by arson and looting were made for several days. When refugees from these areas seeking safety crossed over to the adjacent Indian districts and when the miserable plight of the Hindus in the riot-ridden districts of East Pakistan became known popular reprisals started in these Indian districts.

First retaliatory disturbances started in the districts of 24-Parganas and Nadia and then they spread to Calcutta city and also to some other districts of West Bengal, like Howrah. The disturbances, which must have started on the Indian side about the end of the first week of January, began in Calcutta on 9 December 1963 and may be said to have ended on 22nd, though "incidents" were reported to have not occurred "in the past four days" on the 19th, and, therefore, the riots proper had ceased by the 15th. In the 24-Parganas district they must be said to have continued at least till 23rd, on which date a stabbing case was reported from a place in that district by name Jagaddal and dusk-to-dawn curfew was imposed in areas coming under three police stations in that district.

The curfew order with variations about the length of the period and prohibitory orders was in force at least till 22 January, when the educational institutions of the city, in Calcutta began their normal work. The military personnel put in charge of the city to aid the police and in some parts to act independently on its own was not wholly removed till 20 January.

The Chief Minister of Maharashtra, making an appeal for funds and materials in aid of and in relief to the distress of persons rendered destitute by the riots in West Bengal on 16 January, put the number of such at 2,00,000 (two lakhs). The G.O.C.-in-C, Eastern Command, in charge of the military personnel, stated in Calcutta on the same day that the largest single evacuee camp in the city which had 15,000 Muslim residents evacuated from their homes situated in disturbed areas, was having only 3,000 of them that day as the others had moved to their homes. The previous day's news had reported the Chief Minister of West Bengal as having stated that on that day dry rations were issued to 87,600 persons and cooked food to 13,445. Calcutta news of 13 January had it that 75,000 people from the affected areas were evacuated. By 15th the number of persons arrested in Calcutta was stated to be 3,473 and in the districts over 4000, these arrests evidently having been preventive measures, i.e., the persons

arrested were suspectedly anti-social trouble-makers. The same days' news from Delhi, however, carried the reported statement of the Home Minister of the Union Government which is flatly incongruous with the above statement. He is reported as having said: "Whereas only 180 goondas [anti-social habitual trouble-makers or hooligans] had been arrested before he arrived there [in Calcutta], no less than 8,000 were behind the bars last night when he left."

The news from Calcutta of 19 January 1964 informed the public that the Muslim evacuees were all sent back to their homes from the relief centres "under police and military escort" and more specifically that till "yesterday" evening a total of 14,353 displaced persons had returned to their dwellings. The number of arrests in Calcutta was given as 6,632 in total, 1,643 being for violation of curfew orders, 1956 for "disorderly behaviour", and 2,879 for specific offences, and only 154 as "antisocial characters". The Chief Minister is reported to have stated that dry rations were issued to 90,000 persons and cooked food given to 14,000.

About the distribution and acceptance of cooked food the information vouchsafed by the Chief Minister on 14 January (*Times of India* 15-1-'64) with regret that 5,000 evacuees had declined the cooked food served by the Ramakrishna Mission is worth noting. And the same should be adjudged in the context of two other items of news. The news of 11 January (*Times of India*, 12-1-'64) reported the Vivekananda centenary pandal at Park Circus Maidan among the few things gutted with fire. The Chief Minister of West Bengal told a press conference on 15th that among things seized by the police in North Calcutta there were a country-made pistol, one revolver, 2 pipe guns, 62 live cartridges and some chemicals from one mosque (*Times of India*, 16-1-'64)!

Calcutta news of the 17th reported that the State Government had sanctioned Rs. 30,00,000 (thirty lakhs) for relief to the affected people and that the army had found 1,034 huts wholly destroyed in the 24-Parganas district (*Times of India*, 18-1-'64). On 19 January the police reported the value of the looted property recovered till that day, as over Rs. 80,000. On 15th the Chief Minister stated that 88 persons were killed in Calcutta till 14th and 508 persons were injured. Both categories included the victims of police firing, military firing not being mentioned (*Times of India*, 16-1-'64).

The previous day the Chief Minister was reported to have stated that 52 persons were killed in the city and 325 persons were injured in the disturbances, and 46 persons were killed and 183 persons injured in the police firing (*Times of India*, 15-1-'64). In the districts the disturbances had taken a toll of 57 persons killed and 113 injured as against 5 persons killed in police firing. The news of 13th stated that the four-day disturbances in the city had taken a toll of 40 persons killed including those killed in police firing and about 100 persons injured (*Times of India*, 14-1-'64). The West Bengal Chief Minister gave out on 19th that in Calcutta 65 persons

were killed in the disturbances and 39 by police action and that there were 562 persons injured including 170 who were injured by police action (*Times of India*, 20-1-'64).

It was authoritatively stated on 15th, in reply to the exaggerated accounts of the flight of Muslims from India announced on the Pakistan Radio, that only 5,271 Indian Muslims from 24-Parganas and Nadia districts had by then left for East Pakistan (*Times of India*, 16-1-'64).

The intensity of passion and the determination of the people can be judged from the strength of the crowds and the number of firings they occasioned and stood. From midnight of 11th to the midnight of 12th in Calcutta the fire-brigade attended to 200 cases of arson. On 12th morning the army and the police fired "at least on 50 occasions in two areas where arson and looting was becoming widespread. In the Hooghly District near Ultadanga a crowd of 3,000 held up a passenger train and dragging out three passengers assaulted them—they must have been killed but the news does not say so (*Times of India*, 13-1-'64).

When comparative peace settled on the city of Calcutta 10 or 12 days after the latest statement of the Chief Minister of the State noted above—in the meanwhile fresh atrocities on the Hindus in East Pakistan had started—1st February news from the city put the amount of the property salvaged from looting at Rs. 4,06,000. It is intriguingly interesting that there should have been some fire-arms and 15 live bombs in the salvaged articles (*Times of India*, 3-2-'64). The official report further stated the number of persons returning to their homes from the security camps as 49,309 Muslims and 1,196 Hindus. Usual prohibitory orders figured as having been kept in force in Calcutta and the 24-Parganas District until further notification even in the news of 8th February (*Times of India*, 9-3-'64).

The last echoes of these riots may be said to have died down on 30 June, when the President of India visited some of the predominantly Muslim localities, in the lusty cheering and competitive garlanding of the President by members of the minority community (*Times of India*, 1-7-'64).

A new chain of communal riots started on 18 March 1964 new firstly, because the centres and the institutions in which they started and developed into serious affairs were modern industrial, and in many cases specially planned by Government; secondly, because the communities involved in most of the cases were Muslims and Christians, and thirdly, because the latter were mostly Tribals.

As the Chief Minister of Bihar stated in the Legislature of Bihar State on 25 March, when a train carrying "refugees"—these were mostly Christian Tribals against whom East Pakistanis had raised a storm of oppression—reached Tatanagar (Jamshedpur) on 19 March, the crowd that had gathered at the railway station—news having reached some days earlier about the horrible happenings to their fellow brethren in East Pakistan—got excited and on their way back home set fire to two Muslim shops. The

crowd according to the news of 19 March was 400 strong and the number of shops set fire to was 4. Some members of the crowd attacked the police who dispersed it with brickbats. On March 20 there were some stray cases of stabbing and arson. The same day some Muslims of the place, Sakchi area, organized a raid on a nearby Hindu village. But the vigilance of the police, who opened fire on the violent mob, frustrated their purpose. One Muslim fell a victim to police firing and another was injured (*Times of India*, 20 and 26-3-'64). Soon the trouble spread to tribal areas in Singhbhum and Ranchi districts, and in Orissa to the tribal districts of Sambalpur and Sundergadh.

Rourkela, the steel town of Orissa, was the worst affected where at least for 2 days, 21 and 22 March, the army was in full control with a 24-hour curfew order in force on the night of 20th, and had to fire a total of 21 rounds at 3 places. 250 hooligans were put under arrest in Rourkela town. The official death-roll in the town and its suburbs on 22nd was 62. In Jamshedpur by the same date over 600 persons had been taken into police custody (*Times of India*, 21, 22 and 23-3-'64). The Chief Minister of Orissa stated in the Orissa Assembly, on 23 March that in Rourkela 3,000 people were sheltering in a picture house and a police station, while in Jharsuguda and Belpahar in Sambalpur, on that day, i.e., 3 days after the disturbances had started, 500 people were still under police protection. In the former of the two places curfew was in force for the third day in succession. Till midnight of Sunday, 22 March, the death-toll in the Orissa disturbances was 164. The Delhi news of 23rd had it that according to the Home Minister of the Union Government there had been 200 deaths in the disturbances that took place in Belaghoria, Rourkela, Jamshedpur, Raigarh and a few other places. He put the duration of the disturbances till that date at one week, thus placing the start of riots on 17 March (*Times of India*, 23 and 24-3-'63). But the cuttings in my collection all tend to place the start on 19th, 18th showing some tensions in some of the places.

The Raigarh disturbances actually started on 19th, *The Times of India* issue of 20th informing us, in its news report from Bhopal, that 7 persons were killed and 19 injured "in clashes in a jute mill area at Raigarh", a town in the Bilaspur district of the Madhya Pradesh (*Times of India*, 21-3-'64).

The situation was considered to be so serious even in the Sundergadh and Sambalpur districts of Orissa on 24th that the State Government had asked for a 600 strong army contingent to meet the threat and was expecting it shortly (*Times of India*, 25-3-'64). The Tribals of Sundergadh, many of them being Christians, were greatly excited at the accounts of "thousands of Pakistani Christians having to take refuge in the Garo Hills of Assam". They started on their own task in the right royal fashion of the Santal and Ho revolt—riots of old. On one occasion a crowd of about 10,000 Tribals had to be dispersed. The Prime Minister broadcast a special message

to the nation to maintain peace and harmony on 26th. On that day Chaibasa of Singhbhum District reported that a tribal armed crowd proceeding to set fire to the village of Asantallia in the interior could be dispersed only after 17 rounds of police fire. And the Ranchi news of 28th declared that the Government of India was considering a proposal for air patrolling in the tribal area of Bihar as it had done in the non-tribal troubled areas of that State in 1946 (*Times of India*, 26, 27, 28, and 29-3-'64).

One of the items of news from Patna of 30 March has to be recorded by itself: several persons "belonging to the minority community" were injured on 29th when a bomb being made in a house exploded (*Times of India*, 31-3-'64). At Katihar, early in the week ending 29 March, in the Madhubani Mohalla a large stock of swords, daggers, and knives was recovered (*Times of India*, 30-3-'64).

The *Times of India* issue of 3 April 1964 gave the news of 2nd from Bhuwaneswar that in Rourkela the curfew order was relaxed to the extent that dawn-to-dusk was a free period and that 7,000 employees of the steel plant had reported for work the previous day. The news from Rourkela of 4 April (*Times of India*, 5-4-'64) announced that Government had asked all residents of Rourkela to surrender their arms and ammunitions within 48 hours. On 11 April the military personnel employed in certain disturbed areas of Ranchi district was withdrawn (*Times of India*, 12-4-'64).

The Orissa disturbances reverberated in the State Assembly on 17 April before dying down. A no-confidence motion as a consequence of the recent riots was moved and defeated, 48 voting for and 77 against (*Times of India*, 18-4-'64). The echoes of the Bihar disturbances kept on longer. The Patna news of 28th announced the imposition of collective fines on the non-Muslim residents of the disturbed areas in Singhbhum and Ranchi districts, those on the former district totalling Rs. 2,65,000 and those on the latter only Rs. 21,000.

## CHAPTER

### 11

#### SOME THOUGHTS AND ACTIONS OF MUSLIM INDIANS (I)

Little prospective wisdom can that man obtain, who hurrying onward with the current, or rather torrent of events, feels no interest in their importance \*\*

S. T. COLERIDGE

THE TIMES OF INDIA issue of 14 October 1953 carried a report from the paper's local staff that the President of the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee, Mr S. K. Patil, had convened a meeting of prominent Muslims to discuss how best to bring about "a closer coordination in the work carried out by different Muslim groups and organizations" in order to strengthen the Congress in Muslim areas of the city. According to the same report it was intended to convene an "all-India convention of Muslim leaders" by the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee in order to "bring all *Muslim nationalist parties in the country* under the banner of the Congress." \*\*

Remembering the Congress staking its prestige on and implanting its feet on what it considered to be the solid ground of Nationalist Muslims in the years 1937 to 1945, and also how the Congress and the country came to grief, first in December 1945 and finally on 14 August 1947, when Pakistan was inaugurated by Lord Mountbatten, because the so-called Nationalist Muslims proved to be a small heap rather than a huge solid hill, I was painfully struck by the news. I made a cutting of it and kept it in my file. And since then, along with the newspapers' cuttings I had begun making regarding Hindu—Muslim clashes, I began to gather, though perhaps not so consistently as to enable me to say 'these are all that pertain to the topic', cuttings of other news about the political activities and views, "doings and sayings", of Muslim Indians.

\* S. T. Coleridge as quoted in Professor Bonamy Dobree *English Revolts*, 1937, p. 11.

\*\* Italics mine

Five days after this disturbing report came the ominous news from Aligarh as of 18th October that a three-day Muslim convention will be held there beginning its session on 30 October and that Mr Badrul Duja—this name occurs in the form of Badrudduja in later advices—ex-Mayor of Calcutta Corporation, would preside over it. Delegates from all over the country were expected to attend the Convention which was to discuss the “most important problems of the biggest minority of our country”. The same day’s issue of *The Times of India* (19-10-53), in another but rather prominent place, carried the report, made by the “staff reporter” of the paper, of the meeting of the Secretaries and Presidents of District and Taluka Congress Committees and Congress workers specially convened by the Bombay Pradesh Congress Committee to consider “popularizing Congress activities and consolidating and coordinating Congress work in the Muslim areas”.

This move of the Congress and its local leader had its repercussions. The first one represented in my file is a letter by Mr R. V. Raghavan, dated 20 October and published in *The Times of India* issue of 27th. The points raised by Raghavan are so specific and pertinent that I must quote him rather than paraphrase him. He says: “One fails to understand the logic of Mr Patil. This religion-wise and caste-wise approach, far from bringing about real secularism will lead to religious consciousness [I should have said “religious nationalism”] and inter-communal rivalry. During the pre-independence days, the Congress tried to bring the Muslims to their side by appeasing the fanatic leaders of the Muslim League and we all know the disastrous consequences it led to.” Almost exactly a month after the above news, the staff reporter of the same paper (*Times of India*, 18-11-53) flashed a disclaimer from Mr A. K. Hafizka, General Secretary of the Fourth Party Parliamentary Board, Bombay. Hafizka protested that neither Haji Hasanally P. Ebrahim, the Chairman of the Board, nor Mr A. A. Khan, the leader of the Fourth Party had encouraged, much less sponsored, the move of the Congress to “enlist support of the Muslims for the Congress”. “The question of re-organising the Muslims on a non-communal and national basis, he stated, had been agitating their minds for quite some time particularly since the last general elections.”

The simultaneously flashed news of the holding of a Muslim convention at Aligarh given above should have occupied some space in the daily papers from 1 November till 4th or 5th. Unfortunately in my file I do not find any cutting from *The Times of India* till its issue of 18 November. The lacuna would have been serious but for the kindness of a pupil-friend in Delhi, who, knowing my interest in this subject, sent me a cutting from the paper *Dawn* of Karachi which serves my purpose much better than any number of cuttings from Indian papers put together could have done.

Under the caption “Bharati Muslims’ Convention meets in Aligarh/800

Delegates \* attend Session" in the *Dawn* issue of 3 November 1953, a report from Aligarh as of 2 November fills almost full two columns of the paper. The eight hundred delegates hailing from "all parts of Bharat" met in the session under the Presidentship of Badrudduja, an ex-Mayor of Calcutta "to chalk out a programme for the 'regeneration' of the largest minority of Bharat". The idea of the convention was first mooted by M. M. Bashir who is described as the Convener and described himself as a "disillusioned Congressman". Badrudduja told the reporter of the paper that "there are but two courses open to Muslims of Bharat for attaining their goal to form a new party or to align themselves with the progressive parties of the country". Badrudduja and Ishaque Ilmi, the Chairman of the Reception Committee and Editor of "an independent" [?] Urdu daily to Kanpur, held the view that the "Bharati Muslims" should have a separate political organization, there being "a growing need for an organisation, a platform for the Muslims of Bharat at *this critical juncture of their existence as a community*". Ilmi suggested that the organization should be named Jamiatul Muslimeen and should be competent "to safeguard the moral, religious, cultural, social, educational, economic and linguistic interests of Bharati Muslims as well as safeguard *the rights and guarantees promised to them in the constitution of Free Bharat*." He was opposed to the adoption of the old Muslim League platform because the League, like the Congress, had "associations of the bitter past". The Jamiat-ul Ulema-i-Hind had no mass contact and was thus out of the question as a platform for them. He further said that whatever else the organization might or might not do, it "should ever be prepared to wage a *constitutional war* against tyranny and injustice".

The Convention was to meet in a special pandal put up in the Danpur compound (*Hindustan Times*, 17-11-1953), whose specification in relation to the campus of the Aligarh Muslim University is not available in the few cuttings I have on the subject, including one embodying the first editorial entitled "Communalism at Large" in the issue of *The Times of India* of 20 November. For the inaugural session a procession was taken out from the local Juma Masjid with the President as the head which terminated at the pandal. The first thing the President did there was to unfurl the *Convention's flag* \*\* whose exact shape, size, pattern and design are not clear even from the description the learned editor of *The Times of India* has kindly provided in the editorial mentioned above. It reads: "Divided into two halves, it combines the Tricolor with the Islamic cres-

\* A belated report in *Hindustan Times* (17-11-'53), the first to appear in that paper, about this number said: "It would be nearer truth to place the number of delegates at 65." What an exaggeration in the Pakistani Press which must have served the purpose Muslims had in view, before the tardy truth could reach the world, if ever it did so!

\*\* Italics mine.



cent and star against a green background. A red band runs across the entire length of the flag, symbolising the Jamat's earnestness in cooperating with parties of the left." The halves can be seen to be made vertically and let us take it that the first half was the tricolor. I wonder if the central white portion of this tricolor is suggested to have had the blue wheel on it [?]. The next half was all green with the crescent and the star on it in white. The red band is suggested as having run the whole length of the flag but its location in relation to the height or width of the flag is not specified. It could not have lain in the centre. It must have then run the whole length in the lowest third of the flag, i.e., in the green portion all throughout. *If so the second half bearing the crescent and the star stands for the flag of Pakistan!* Whether the red band represented anything symbolically is doubtful. A straightforward look at the composite flag must show it to be a combination of the Indian flag in part, for I doubt if it had the wheel on it, and the Pakistani flag in full!

All the sessions of the Convention were held at night, the object plainly being "to enable Aligarh Muslim University students<sup>1</sup> to attend them in which the organizers succeeded to some extent".

The President, Badrudduja, brushed aside the idea of co-operation with the Congress because he maintained that "it had failed the Muslims both in administration and as a Party. 'It had shown nothing but scant regard for the constitution in so far as it relates to the minorities in general and the Muslims in particular'".\* The main points in the presidential address, as they stand out in the *Dawn* report are:

(1) The aim of the Convention is to foster "the friendliest relations" between Bharat and Pakistan.— (References to India throughout, even to the Constitution of India, is in terms of Bharat, the term India not appearing even once in the report. This is a noteworthy feature revealing the mental under-current of Muslims in India. They decline to admit that this country shorn of Pakistan is India though that is the name it received from the British as its heritage on the day of the new set-up after Pakistan was formed and named. The idea appears to be to deny to India the rights of the paramountcy, which it acquired from the British, *vis-a-vis* the Indian States and to keep their incorporation into India a live and unsettled question of legality!)

(2) The suggestion that the Bharati Muslims because they "belonged to the Muslim League before partition" are not to be trusted is the idea of interested parties and has no basis in fact, "the general elections in Bharat" having "conclusively proved that the majority of Bharati Muslims were round the Congress".

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Also Dr Sampurnanand, the then Home Minister of U.P., as reported in the *Times of India*, 25-11-1953.

\* The whole quotation is in bold type in the paper. The italics are mine and are intended to remind the reader that there is no mention, anywhere in the Constitution

(3) Bharati Muslims "know full well that no useful purpose will be served by looking either towards Pakistan or any other Muslim country for help or guidance".

(4) In free Bharat there was a "massacre of Muslims, uprooting lakhs of them, colossal devastation of their properties, desecration of their mosques, mausoleums and graveyards" which had created "a sense of horror, insecurity and frustration in their minds".

(5) There is "cultural bigotry and fanaticism" in free Bharat "against the minorities" and "*Urdu the second largest spoken language of the world and still the lingua franca of Bharat, was being denied the status of even a regional language despite a constitutional provision to that effect*".\*

(6) The Osmania University of Hyderabad—Hyderabad was not till then broken up into its constituent linguistically homogeneous areas and incorporated in the respective linguistic States of Andhra Pradesh, Mysore and Maharashtra— which had Urdu as the medium of instruction was being turned into a Hindu University.

(7) The evacuee property laws were spelling disaster for the Muslims.

(8) Muslims have been having "little representation in the legislature of the country and have been conspicuous for their absence in Government offices". Badrudduja laid the responsibility for this state of affairs on "*those Muslim legislators who refused the provision in the draft constitution of Bharat for reservation of seats for Muslims for 10 years*".\*\*

(9) "We do not want to revive military [militant] communalism."

I shall quote \*\*\* here a few sentences from the preroration in the Presidential Address of Janab Badrudduja which are most relevant in the context of our topic from the Address under the abovenoted heading and author's name published as a pamphlet of 38 pages in 1953 and priced at two annas (one-eighth of a rupee) of which I happened to get a copy, is not, at least easily, available:

"During centuries of *our rule in India*, we opened up all possibilities for

of India, of Muslims, either as a minority or as anything else!

\* Italics mine. There is no such provision about any language. The President has been given by Article 347 the power, after a due procedure, to declare in respect of any language spoken by any section of the population of a State that it shall be an alternate language of that State.

\*\* Italics mine. The fact of the matter is B. Pocker Sahib moved an amendment for reservation etc. which was simply negatived. Vallabhbhai Patel declaring that with Pakistan granted, "the 80 per cent India" [?] that remained was one nation and that it was understood that there would be no "talk of two nations". *Constituent Assembly Debates*, Vol. v, p. 246. In another connection Govind Vallabh Pant sounded even a sterner warning against any talk of "Two Nations Theory", *Constituent Assembly Debates*, VII, p. 915.

\*\*\* Italics mine.

the original inhabitants of the land, far less neglecting their legitimate demands. Even in the Military and Finance Departments, Hindus occupied the highest positions of trust which even the Britishers in the 20th century could not confer upon Indians . . . I would now make a *fervent appeal to Muslim youths* to rise to the height of the occasion and usher in a renaissance of Islam, regeneration of the community along with other fellow citizens of the State. I would urge upon you to shed all your communal or sectional complexes and rise above the tendencies of petty-foggers, *fulfilling the dream of your great ancestors who struggled and bled unto death for the cause of righteousness, truth and justice on earth.* Often in stillness of night, in the depth of solitude, in the grim silence of the heavens . . . have I pondered over the darksome fate of Islam and the Muslim community and my thought has been instinctly drawn, not to the great Nation Builders of Modern India, but to your plastic impressionable minds that throb with genuine emotion, pulsate with new hopes and aspirations and dream beautiful dreams of a new India, a greater, happier and brighter India. . . Never during the last 200 years were we faced with more difficult questions, with more desperate situation; never during these long and weary years was statesmanship in greater demand to harmonize the conflicting interests and to reconcile the divergent claims of the component wholes in India. . . Centuries have rolled by, the tides of empires have risen and fallen in this land of ours, our forbears have themselves presided over the destinies of India for ages. Unfortunately, however, we are fallen on evil days. Dark and ominous clouds that had gathered over our heads suddenly burst on our shoulders immediately after Partition and even today they refuse to lift.

Amidst the encircling gloom of cruel disappointment all round, with throbbing hearts and wistful eyes do we look forward to Aligarh to-day to give us light and lead once again. At difficult crisis of our chequered existence, Aligarh gave us a lead so often and guided our faltering steps in our journey across the life's solemn main [?]. Amidst dark and darkening shadows of despair, Aligarh held aloft the torch to lit [?] up the path for succeeding generations of Muslims. There in that Historic Hall, in the sagacious councils of the great and the deep deliberations of the wise, were sown the germs of Islamic renaissance in India, which in later years blossomed forth in all their fullness, majesty and glory . . ."

It may be noted here that, as another chapter of this work will have told the reader, the true story of Islamic renaissance in India as narrated by at least three Pakistani intellectuals of a high order, working in well-known American Universities or University centres, Ahmad, Malik, and Qureshi, makes Shah Waliullah (1702-1762 A.D.), if not Ahmad Sirhindi, more than a century earlier, the father of it. And he was neither an Aligarhi, nor even had Aligarh existed then as a centre of Islamic or any learning!

Evidently under his camouflaged eloquence Badrudduja wanted and quite naturally and correctly had expected to be understood to suggest the immediate revivers of the Muslim spirit of conquest, from Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the founder of Aligarh, to the formulators, or at least the most persistent propagators, of the two-Nations theory of the pre-Partition decade!

The special correspondent of the *Hindustan Times* (17-11-'53) in his despatch from Aligarh revealed that M. M. Bashir, the convener of the Convention, was a draper from Aligarh, and that he had passed through most of the parties of the country having been a member for sometime of the Ahrar party, the Congress, the Khaksars, the Muslim League, Jamat-ul-Ulema and Socialist party. He disclosed that the President of the Aligarh University Students' Union, Ahmed Saeed, who was just then going out of office, spoke from the platform of the Convention and that the President of the Convention, Badrudduja, was given a reception and welcome in the Students' Union. The new President of the Union contradicted some statements made by the correspondent, particularly about Saeed's political alignment, pointing out that he was the President of the University unit of the Youth Congress, an organization which worked "under the guidance of the Provincial Congress Committee". But the main facts of the case stand as reported by the special correspondent.

*The Times of India* issue of 25 November reported that on 23rd Rafi Ahmad Kidwai, then the Union Food Minister, paid a brief visit to Lucknow and conferred with the Chief Minister of U.P. to explain the Centre's attitude to the U.P. Government, which finally resulted in the latter taking no action against anyone concerned in the convening and conducting of the Convention. It stated at the end that the Prime Minister Pandit Nehru had described the line adopted, the establishment of a separate political organization beside the All-India Muslim Jamat, by the convention as "vicious" (*The Times of India*, 20-11-1953, editorial). The editorial leader of *The Times of India* ending with "the mischief that the Jamat can do by pouring communal venom in young minds like those it befriended at Aligarh and by rousing communal passions may not be serious: but Government would be well-advised to nip it in the bud", coming after all that had transpired in the three weeks, is, to say the least, very complacent and unhelpful.

One G. A. Merchant, a Muslim, protesting against doubts cast by a Hindu correspondent against the loyalty of a section of Muslim Indians, in his letter of 29 December (*The Times of India*, 1-1-1954) says: "It is difficult to appreciate Mr Nanavaty's views when one sees that during the last six years the Muslims of India have never lent active or passive support to Pakistani propaganda against India." Readers will, however, on the background of the brief account of the Convention and its close connection with Pakistani agents and propaganda as well as its peculiar flag, and in the light

of the remarks of the special correspondent will, if charitably minded, tend to condone Mr Merchant's ignorance or complacency and draw the same conclusion as appears to have been adumbrated by Mr Nanavaty.

On 4 January 1954, Maulana Noorulla Hussain Iftikari, President of Hyderabad State—Hyderabad was till then a State—Jamiat-ul-Ulema, led a six-man delegation to Pandit Nehru who had gone to Hyderabad. Prefacing, presumably by oral assurances of the organization's co-operation with the Government "in fighting communalism and preserving the hard-won freedom of the country" it submitted a written memorandum whose main items were:

1. Speedy disposal of the cases of illegal possession of property;
2. Reinstatement of retrenched teachers;
3. Retention of Urdu in Government departments; and
4. General amnesty to all political prisoners (*Times of India*, 5-1-1964)

The delegation was thus interested in white-washing and condoning various sections of Muslims that were rightly being punished for their misdeeds during and before the "Hyderabad affair" which led to the integration of the State with India!

April of 1954 brought in the first open and public avowal of the Muslim League and the meeting of the All-India Muslim Conference. Mohammed Ismail, described, in the news from Calicut as of 10 April, as President of the Indian Union Muslim League, said that the Muslim League was the only political organization of the Muslims of India, and "it was a *national right*\* of a minority community to have such an organization and to exercise its privilege of self-expression through it".

I am not sure that the talk about banning communal organizations, which ultimately fizzled out besides whatever exacerbation it created, and the reasoning and ingenuity it brought to the fore during its wayward existence of about seven years, had started then. Perhaps I think Mr Ismail was well beforehand with time and events in his insistence on the right of self expression through an organization. I, however, think that he need not have brought in his status of a minority member. For I think the right to free-expression and free association and organization is one of the rights guaranteed by the country's Constitution to all—whether the persons exercising it belong to a minority or to a majority, which terms, by

\* Italics mine and are intended to impress upon the reader the need to note the use of the adjective "*national*" qualifying minority community, though in the actual wording not directly. In the Constitution of India, of course, there is no "minority" which is "*national*". A "minority" is only religious" or "linguistic" and not national, geographical, political or economic, nor even cultural. As a matter of fact this gentleman's active participation in the deliberations of the Constituent Assembly was marked by a persistent attempt to get Muslims recognized as a specifically protected minority.

the by, are not defined or even described in the Constitution.

Mohammed Ismail, presiding over the Malabar District Political Conference, outlined the three-fold objective of the League of which the first is the usual, almost ritualistic one, of professing and insisting that the hard-won freedom and integrity of the country shall be maintained. The two of real significance, being concerned with the purpose of the meeting, an organization or a delegation, were:

1. to protect the legitimate rights and interests of Muslim and other minorities \*;
2. to promote harmony and unity among the Muslims and other communities of India.

The one argument in favour of a separate Muslim organization advanced in Ismail's speech is that "Muslims have not been given adequate and proper representation" in the legislatures of the country.

The first stage of attack on the integrity of the country as it emerged from the throes of the partition of the country as it was under the British rule and suzerainty is achieved by Ismail, who, in contrast with the broadside tirade of the Muslim Convention of 1953 held at Aligarh, very tactfully chose to put up only one of the half a dozen demands calculated to disintegrate the country and secure a separatist existence of Muslims, with which Indians were pestered by the pre-partition Muslim League for about half-a-century and which were supposed to have ended with the partition of the country! Mr Ismail and Mr Badrudduja 12 years ago awakened the country and asked it to listen to the same old tune fairly early. Thanks to them for the same, for the Government and the party in power cannot say afterwards, when things would have gone too far to make it impossible to wade back, that they had no knowledge of such tendencies and demand!

The All-India Muslim Conference announced (*Times of India*, 13-4-1954) to be held at Lucknow for three days, 23, 24, and 25 April, was to be presided over by the great—second great of course, the first being Sheikh Abdulla who was by then behind the prison bars—Kashmir's "national leader", Baxi Gulam Mahommed, and was to be attended by foreign observers from some Muslim countries. I am sorry there is nothing further in my file about it.

On 26th May, Syed Badrudduja, described now as the President of the All-India Muslim Jamiat, addressing at Farukhabad the second annual session of the Jamiat, alleging that the Government was meting out discriminative treatment to Muslims, urged his co-religionists to join the organization to safeguard their interests. He told his audience that the Osmania University of Hyderabad was converted into a Hindi University, suggesting

\* Italics mine. Please note the brave pose as champion of all groups other than caste-Hindus, like that of Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah and his Muslim League before Partition

that the step was taken by the Government because "the university was a centre of Muslim culture" and the Government wanted to destroy it. "*He advocated the adoption of Urdu as the second official language of India*" (*The Times of India*, 28-5-'56. Italics mine.)

Two years after this (*Times of India*, 18-5-1956) a convention of South Indian Muslims held at Coimbatore resolved not to continue the Muslim League but to call another convention of Muslims at Madras in June that year "to consider ways and means for the cooperation of Muslims with progressive elements in the country for the advancement of the community".

Late in August (*Times of India*, 20-8-1956) Aligarh figured in the news as the venue for the expression of Muslim frustration and intransigence. At the Muharram processions on the night of Friday a section of the mourners shouted the slogan "Pakistan Zindabad" as four rowdy youths who would not move from the vicinity of a temple by the wayside were ordered away by the District Magistrate.

September saw the great agitation set on foot against the book *Religious Leaders*, which contained some observations rather derogatory to Prophet Muhammad. In the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha to a question tabled by a member Government replied that "last week, i.e., end of August, students of Aligarh University had taken out a procession carrying an effigy of the U.P. Governor", the book having been sponsored by the organization of which he was the sole moving spirit, and having beaten it with shoes had burnt it. To the supplementary question whether the processionists had shouted the slogans "Hindustan Murdabad" /may India be dead/ and "Pakistan Zindabad" /may Pakistan flourish/ the Government reply was the usual evasive one of an enquiry being made (*Times of India*, 7-9-1956). On 13 September (*Times of India*, 14-9-1956) Maulana Azad, the Education Minister of the Union Government categorically denied in the Loka Sabha that such slogans were shouted.\* Pandit Nehru, intervening when another member mentioned the Muslim League as trouble-maker, said: "I do not recognise the Muslim League. If there is such a thing in India, so far as I am concerned, it should be ignored and suppressed—not legally but by public opinion." He added "amidst laughter" that it was rather odd (?) that a few stray persons should wave its flag in India when for all practical

\* It must be mentioned here in view of Maulana Azad's reported denial of the shouting of the slogans "Pakistan Zindabad", "Hindustan Murdabad", that evidently in the Vidhan Sabha of U.P. the Deputy Home Minister of U.P. had stated on 6 September 1956, that "the students of Aligarh University took out processions, shouting *Pakistan Zindabad Hindustan Murdabad*". He had further "criticised the teachers of Aligarh University for directly and indirectly helping these demonstrations, and the Vice-Chancellor and Proctor of the University for failing to assist the district officials in the restoration of order" (*Times of India*, 17-10-'61, Uttar Pradesh Newsletter).

purposes it had ceased to exist in the neighbouring country (Pakistan) (?).

The next day, 14 September, Aligarh reported an attack on a procession taken out by students of the local educational institutions except the Aligarh University "to protest against what they described as anti-national activities of the students and authorities of the University" (*Times of India*, 15-9-'56). The anti-national activities referred mainly to the part Muslim students of Aligarh University had taken in what is known briefly as "the book agitation", against the remarks contained in the book *Religious Leaders* published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan of which Dr K. M. Munshi was the guide and president. The Deputy Minister for Home Affairs in the U. P. Government had stated in the Vidhan Sabha that the students of Aligarh University had taken out processions shouting *Pakistan Zindabad, Hindustan Murdabad* (*Times of India*, 17-10-1961, Uttar Pradesh Newsletter).

The minister had "criticised the teachers of the Aligarh University for directly and indirectly helping these demonstrations, and the Vice-Chancellor and Proctor of the University for failing to assist the district officials in the restoration of order". (*ibid*).

After a week, a report from Aligarh dated 21 September brought the news of Mohammed Mulhashar Khan, President of the Muslim University Students' Union and seven other students of the University [Muslim?] having been expelled by S. Nurullah, Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University for "raising anti-national slogans and burning an effigy of Mr K. M. Munshi, Governor of U.P. on September 1" (*The Times of India*, 22-9-'56). The Governor as the Chancellor of the University had appointed a committee to inquire into the happenings of 1 September when a procession to protest against the derogatory remarks against the Prophet in the book *Religious Leaders* was taken out. The committee having submitted its report to the University Disciplinary Committee, the latter had recommended the expulsion of the 8 students. The inquiry committee stated that the *Bhagavadgita* was not, as asserted in some of the papers and by some persons, burnt or dishonoured in anyway "anywhere in the University".

For the 19th session of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind held at Surat on 27 October 1956 nearly 500 delegates from all over the country were reported as having gathered. There were "two fraternal delegates from Egypt", among the non-delegates. Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani presided and Morarji Desai, then Chief Minister of Bombay, inaugurated the session. The Chairman of the Reception Committee, Gulam Rasul Kureshi, welcomed the delegates and presented an address to Morarji Desai. Maulana Madani asked Muslims to forget communalism and referred to the agitation that was set afoot in some parts of the country over the book *Religious Leaders* and while condemning "the villifying campaign against Islam", evidently indicated by the rather derogatory



observations about Prophet Muhammad contained in the book, he affirmed that it was "imperative for a Muslim to respect the religious sentiments of others and their teachers".

On 17 September 1957, from Hyderabad came the news about the once famous leader of Razakars, who were expected to save Hyderabad, Kazim Razvi. Apparently he was let out of the prison where he was lodged 9 years earlier at the end of the "Hyderabad affair"; and he was bent on leaving for Pakistan. As the President of the organization known as Majlis Ilthad-ul-Muslimin he convened a meeting of it which was attended by 40 members. The Razakar wing of the Majlis was banned after the "Hyderabad affair" but the Majlis was not. In the meeting he is said to have nominated his successor, the news item (*Times of India*, 18-9-1957) not mentioning his name.

In spite of or perhaps because of all that happened during the 5½ years that elapsed between the first Muslim convention held in Aligarh in 1953 and 1959, a movement for regeneration of the Muslim League came from the extreme southwest of the country, from Kerala, the stronghold of the Muslim group known as Moplahs, whose capacity for turbulence is evident from what is presented in another part of this study. Jawaharlal Nehru was reported in the *Modern Review* (January 1956, p. 19) as having said about the League in a public meeting at Kozikode (Calicut): "In Malabar, I am told, there is a remnant of the old Muslim League. It is amazing that this discreditable organization—that worked against Indian freedom and brought misery to India—should raise its head in Malabar area."

The League, however, has evidently gone on from strength to strength in Kerala and had won 8 seats in its Assembly. C. H. Mohamed Koya,\* the young leader of the 8 member-Muslim-League Party in the Kerala Assembly, as reported in *The Times of India* in its issue of 9 July 1959, on his return from Haj, sacred pilgrimage, speaking at a reception in Bombay accorded to him by the Bombay Kerala Muslim Yuvajana Sangham urged the Muslim leaders of Bombay to revive the Muslim League. He is reported to have exhorted his listeners thus in the words of the reporter:

Muslims from all over India used to receive inspiration from Muslims of Bombay before the advent of freedom. *But after India became free*, perhaps owing to the special difficulties confronting them, *Bombay Muslims, who had played a prominent role in the Khilafat and Pakistan agitations ceased to lead the Muslim community of the country*. But the Muslims of Kerala, he said, continued to hold the flag of the Muslim League against all odds. . . *Kerala Muslims were branded as "communa-*

\* Before this had the good fortune to go to press the Hon'ble Mr Koya was already an important member of the Government of Kerala.

*lists" by persons high and low, including the Prime Minister of India, because they refused to dissolve the Muslim League organization.\**

He pointed out the contrast between the organizational set up in the North and in Kerala. In the North, the Uttar Pradesh, where the Muslim League did not exist such Hindu organizations as the Hindu Mahasabha and the Jan Sangh flourished but in Kerala where the Muslim League was functioning neither of them could make any headway. Exhorting the Bombay Muslims further not to mind their being branded as "communalists" Koya, to clinch the issue, observed:

*As long as minority communities existed in the country, organizations working for protecting and preserving their interests were bound to exist. It was strange to ask them to dissolve the Muslim League, simply because it worked for the creation of Pakistan. Had the Congress entered into an alliance with the League, the Communist Party would not have come into power there. Now the different political parties in the State were trying to woo that organization, [the Muslim League], because its support was useful to them.\*\**

In the Current Topics columns of *The Times of India* of the 13 July 1960, figured the news that Jamiat-ul-Ulema leader in Bihar had held out a threat that Muslims in the State will not vote for the Congress unless (1) more Muslims were appointed to the public services, (2) the use of Urdu was encouraged, and (3) there was adequate emphasis on the education of Muslims.

Almost 3 years after Kazim Razvi's announcement of his projected departure to Pakistan, noted above, he and his Majlis Itte-had-ul-Muslimin figured in the news, its General Secretary, Khaja Nizamuddin writing in *The Times of India* (28-7-'60). He stated *inter alia* that

1. the Majlis was functioning within the limits of the Indian Constitution;
2. it was receiving no direction—"it is absurd to say that the Majlis is receiving any direction" is the actual wording—from Kazim Razvi "who is now a national of Pakistan";
3. the amended constitution of the Majlis provided for its taking part in elections;
4. the Majlis gained "a big victory in the Hyderabad municipal elections" securing 18 seats;
5. the Majlis had given tickets as its candidates not only to Muslims but also "to a considerable number of non-Muslims";

\* Italics mine.

\*\* Italics mine.

6. the Majlis had secured fifty thousand out of the total sixty-two thousand votes; and
7. the Majlis would "certainly take part in the general election in 1962".

Mohammed Ismail, described as the President of the Indian Union Muslim League, who, 5 years before Koya's thundering exhortation was delivered to Bombay Muslims, had proclaimed the vigorous and militant existence of the Muslim League in a challenging and very explicit manner as above narrated, delivered a still more thunderous broadside in Madras on 17th September 1960, i.e., about 14 months after Koya's announcement in Bombay. Mohammed Ismail,\* a Keralian Muslim, was presiding over the Tamil Nad Muslim League conference. He repeated almost precisely the three objectives of the League which he had stated in his earlier performance 6 years before, briefly summarized above.

Mohammed Ismail made at least three more points which are of the nature of either rejoinders or/and challenges. The first point he made is evidently a sharp reply to Pandit Nehru's assertion mentioned above regarding the nonentity-like, phantom nature of the organization. Ismail is reported to have regretted "that politicians, particularly of the Congress persuasion, had been indulging in 'wishful thinking and crying that the League was not in existence.' *But the fact which had been evident to those who were not reluctant to see the reality was that 'the Muslim League was not only in existence but was very much alive all the time'.*"\*\*

The second point in Ismail's speech referred to the position of the League in Kerala and made a charge of unfair treatment of it by the Congress which had accepted the League as its partner just to secure itself and then abandoned it, and rated the Congress thus:

And yet the leaders of the same Congress, who were saying until the other day that *the relics of the non-existent Muslim League were only to be placed in a museum* had to come forward and put a distinguished representative of the same organization [Koya?] at the head of whole and important department [?] the legislature of Kerala State.

The third point Ismail made adds to his single prospective demand of reserved electorates, two others, (1) that of reservation of posts in the

\* The same gentleman who by tabling frequent and persistent amendments to certain Articles of the draft Constitution of India when it came for consideration before the Constituent Assembly, sought to secure the rights of an exclusive minority to Muslims but failed in all his attempts.

<sup>2</sup> *The Times of India*, 18-9-1960. Italics mine.

\*\* Italics are mine and are intended to draw the readers' attention to the exultant tone of Ismail's thrust at Pandit Nehru.

public services and (2) special treatment in economic commercial matters. He listed the "grievances and disabilities" of the Muslims in India thus: "... the lists of recruits for public services are conspicuous by the rarity of Muslim names in them . . . many Muslims feel it is difficult to obtain such things as quotas and licences, though they have been in the particular lines concerned for years together."

Ismail again reiterated, as he had done previously, and as Koya had done on a later occasion, that to organize themselves into a well-knit body to formulate and ventilate their views as a community the Muslims in India had "the right to do so provided for in the Constitution. Their maintaining, therefore, an organization was perfectly constitutional."

Only 12 weeks before the delivery of Mohammed Ismail at Madras in the South-east corner of the country, horrible happenings on the linguistic front in the dangerously poised North-east part, Assam, had shaken the lethargy and complacency of many of the publicists. And the editor of *The Times of India* hastened to pen one of the most thoughtful leading articles, post-haste on 23 September. To confine myself for the present to the situation arising out of Ismail's position and declaration, I should begin by mentioning that the learned editor was not surprised, in the country's prevailing situation, that the Muslim League should be revived, though he clearly saw that it can "harm the already fragile fabric of national unity". He pitifully admits further that Mr Ismail's way of thinking seems to be shared by an increasing number of Muslims in Kerala, Madras, Andhra, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. He envisages the possibility of the Muslim League "in one guise or another" contesting the next general elections—this was written only about six months before the elections of 1962, almost on the eve of "the next general elections"—in several States. The editor rightly observed further: "Its constitutional right to do so cannot be questioned and talk about banning the party can only be considered thoughtless."

That the learned editor had only understated the ubiquity of the Muslim League sentiment became clear within a week's time. In the issue of his paper for October, i.e., on the eve of Mahatma Gandhi's birthday, he published the letter dated 22 September of S. A. Ansari, who described his own designation as member of the Muslim League Organizing Committee Maharashtra State. The letter made it quite plain that one more State, viz., Maharashtra was to be added to the list of Muslim League States of the country made by the editor of *The Times of India* on the 23 September. Thus only Assam, West Bengal and Orissa had remained then outside the ambit of the League! Another Muslim from Bombay, S. M. Hussain adding his quota by his letter of 11 October (*Times of India*, 13-10-'60) clinched the issue for Maharashtra as regards its orientation to the Muslim League. He wrote: "We may brand the Muslim League a communal organization but there is no other alterna-

tive. The Muslims in India being the foremost minority have to have such an organization through which the Government as well as the other minorities in India can consult Muslim opinion."

The only rift in the lute or rather the only tune not in harmony with that of Muslim 'special' interests first came from M. F. Sikandar. Writing on 4 October (*Times of India*, 6-10-1960), he complimented the editor of *The Times of India* on his having reminded his readers that the revival of the Muslim League for its political activities was dangerous. He himself reminded them and his co-religionists that the Bombay Branch of that body in pre-republican India was wound up in 1948. Some of the members had created a Fourth Party which sent some members to the Municipal Corporation of Bombay in 1952. My account of the sayings and doings of Muslims in India, readers may be reminded, begins with S. K. Patil's attempt to rally to the Congress this Party, which was apparently functioning as such till then at least in the Legislature of the State. Sikandar says that the Party was soon merged into the Congress and lauds "this secular approach" naturally as "admirable". The Muslims of Bombay (Bombay State?) remained loyal to that approach in the two general elections of 1952 and 1957 as well as in the civic elections of 1957. Under these circumstances the revival of the Muslim League in Bombay was painful to him. His further assertion is well worth quoting as it states a correct principle and a true fact. He says: "The problems of poverty and illiteracy of the Muslim masses are in no way different from those of the non-Muslims. These problems are vigorously tackled under the plans made by the Central as well as the State governments, and the Muslims are surely going to be benefitted by them."

Sikander was followed and supported by three other Muslims with more or less similar views about the revival of the Muslim League, S. A. Bashir from Ahmedabad, Mumtaz Ali from Harda and Mushtak Ali from Bombay (*The Times of India*, 14-10-1960). Bashir told the Muslims of India that their salvation did not lie in their organizing themselves under a political banner but in their intellectual renaissance and a rational and non-sectarian interest in education, the last point being stressed by Mushtak Ali too. Mumtaz Ali advised them to join secular parties.

In *The Times of India* issue of 20 January 1961, one read the news from Madras that about 50 Muslim League partisans caused confusion at a public meeting held under the auspices of the Tamil Nad Muslim Convention, booing down Janab K. A. Sultan Mohideen, the President as he criticized the Muslim League, and shouted the slogans "Pakistan Zindabad". The Police restored order. The writer of the Current Topics column of the paper, commenting on this slogan-raising the next day, pointing out that the slogans were heard "now and then at Muslim League meetings elsewhere in the country" contended that "in the light of the League's past history the people cannot but regard it as an expression of

*anti-national sentiment*".\*

The year 1961 will long be remembered as the worst period of internal stresses and strains, revealing deep fissures in the body social widely spread among the populace, particularly that of the North and the Centre, and a sore in a high educational centre.

The contentions of a Nationalist Muslim in a letter dated 21 January 1961, (published in *The Times of India*, 30-1-'61) begin a series of revelations and deeds that justify the observation made above. The gentleman, who was convinced that it was the Congress that was pampering the Muslim League into existence and vigour, states that

1. the meeting of the Muslim League held in the Gokhale Hall at Madras on January 19 declared its loyalty to Pakistan;
2. a meeting of nationalist Muslims was disturbed by some of these Muslim Leagues shouting the slogans "Pakistan Zindabad", "Muslim League Zindabad";
3. its volunteers tried to attack K. A. Sultan Mohideen, President of the Tamilnad Muslim Convention; and
4. The League has established Pakistani pockets by organizing "the more communally minded of Muslims wherever available".

Soon thereafter the shocking tragedy of Jabalpur was enacted. *The Times of India* devoted its first leading article to it, under the caption of "Jabalpur", in its issue of 10 February 1961. From among the main points raised in it the following remark will suffice for our purpose:

Jabalpur is a grim reminder that the communal poison has yet to be flushed out of the nation's system. . . The real trouble is that too many people, among them the country's leaders, pretend that all is well on the communal front and that incidents such as those in Jabalpur now or in Ferozepur last September or in Sitamarhi and Bhopal two years ago are an occasional throwback to the bad old days which belong to the dead past. . . *The past is still very much with us.* And it will remain with us, posing a latent threat to national unity, so long as we pretend that the relations between the two major communities do not need to be improved consciously.

The soundness of the observation cannot be doubted; but the further question gives a headache. Having fully realized the need for better, active and permanent relations between the Muslims and the Hindus, what is the bell that will be fit and adequate enough for the cat to be belled with? Is this not a case where the cat to be belled has to be a willing

\* Italics mine.

partner in the process of belling? And if it is yes, can we, under the existing Constitution of the country, do it effectively? All these are questions which require to be answered before one exposes the so-called complacency with or ignorance of or connivance at the realities of social India.

Aligarh University occupied the foreground of the Indian scene of January 1961 with the report of the Aligarh Muslim University Inquiry Committee, *The Times of India* featuring a longish—much too long I think for the kind of report we have—summary of it in its issue of 28th and devoting its first leading article of the issue of 31st to it under the heading “Aligarh”.

In the leading article the editor, with what would appear to be tact, but a kind of tact which has proved futile during the history of the University and will be seen to have miserably failed in its purpose later, begins by observing that the Banaras University had already had its turn of a committee of inquiry and its report criticizing it two years earlier. Further unctuous salve is spread out through the notice of a contrast between the report under reference on Aligarh University and the past one on Banaras University, pointing out that the former “is more mildly worded than” the latter. Truthfully the editor adds, however:

*But it tells the same incredible story of gross irregularities, of wasteful expenditure and over-payments, of failure to maintain records, of wrong [?] staff appointments and of subversion of the system of selection committees. The report reveals that two successive Vice-Chancellors of the university have often used their emergency powers to sanction expenditure without a sense of propriety.\**

Telling his readers that audit-objections made from time to time were parried with ruses, one among which having been that of the plea that the persons concerned had gone to Pakistan when as a matter of fact they were in India, i.e., with a blank and blatant lie which in itself proved the existence of disloyalty in the core of the University in so far as the country of emigration was stated to be Pakistan, the editor delivers his evaluative judgment thus: “The disclosures are dismal enough to make all talk of academic freedom and university autonomy meaningless”. He picks out, evidently because he must have thought it very significant and seriously deserving of close pondering over, as “pertinent”, one point made out by the Committee, which states “the contrast between the pre-independence and post-independence periods in the management of the university under the same set of rules”.

The two Vice-Chancellors during whose careers the grave irregularities

\* Italics mine.

and possible embezzlement of funds are reported by the committee to have occurred are not named either in the report<sup>3</sup> or in the editorial summary and comments from which I have presented above a few points. I think this is neither fair to the public nor to the purpose of such enquiries.

The emergency powers were used in 135 cases of financial nature during the 5 years 1955-56 to 1959-60, out of which in as many as 52 cases, as 4 out of the 6 members of the committee categorically assert, they "need not have been invoked".<sup>4</sup> To estimate properly the intransigence of the Vice-Chancellor, Colonel B. H. Zaidi, and the University, it is necessary to summarize at least very briefly the history which led to the appointment of the Enquiry Committee, on whose report the editor of *The Times of India* wrote the leading article.

In pursuance of the general import of the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission bearing on the Central Universities the Union Government passed the Aligarh Muslim University Amendment Act of 1951.

Of the changes introduced those which are important for our purpose here are<sup>5</sup>:

1. The University shall be open to persons of either sex and of whatever race, creed, or class.
2. It shall not be lawful for the University to adopt or impose on any person, any test whatsoever of religious belief or profession in order to entitle him to be admitted therein as a teacher or student, or to hold office therein, or to graduate thereat, or to enjoy or exercise any privilege thereof except in respect of specifically earmarked private benefactions in the University.
3. Religious instruction may be given only to those who have consented to receive it; "In other words what has come to be known as 'the Conscience Clause' was extended to the Muslim University, Aligarh. This meant that students who did not wish to receive instruction in Muslim Theology, could offer some alternative course".<sup>6</sup>
4. The Comptroller and Auditor General of India was to audit the accounts of the University.

In accordance with the last-mentioned provision of the Amending Act of 1951 the first audit was conducted by the Accountant General of Uttar Pradesh, who submitted the Preliminary Audit Report to the University and to the Visitor, the President of India, in March 1953. It pointed out

<sup>3</sup> *Report of the Aligarh Muslim University Enquiry Committee*, 1961, pp. 52-3 and Appendices, p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Report, op. cit.*, pp. 52-3.

<sup>5</sup> *Report, op. cit.*, pp. 1, 48, 112.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 129-130.



that the state of University accounts was far from satisfactory and that the finances of the University were in a mess. *Inter alia* it mentioned that "the University had sustained heavy losses in certain financial transactions at the hands of its employees, some of whom had migrated to Pakistan". It further suggested that a departmental enquiry might be conducted in respect of the specific irregularities brought out in the Report.

The Vice-Chancellor, Dr Zakir Husain, appointed a committee of three members. The Committee after two preliminary meetings went to sleep and there was no report from it. In May 1954 a copy of the final Inspection Report on the accounts of the University for the years 1951-52 and 1952-53 was sent by the Accountant General to the Vice-Chancellor. The University sent replies to the Accountant General in four instalments, dated June 1955, July 1955, February 1956 and March 1956. In June 1956 the Government of India enquired from the Vice-Chancellor whether the Audit Inspection Report was going to be submitted to the old committee which had not done anything about its earlier assignment. The University replied that it would reply to the Audit objections itself without the intervention of any committee and introduce improvement in the maintenance of its accounts. Some time thereafter, it would appear, the University appointed an expert technical committee under the chairmanship of a retired Chief Engineer, Uttar Pradesh, to examine the Audit objections regarding the accounts of the building activities. The committee could do nothing as the information required by it was not supplied by the University!

Whatever the University did or did not do in pursuance of its written assurance to the Union Government, the latter in the Ministry of Education, after a detailed examination of the Audit objections and University replies thereto, wrote to the University in April 1957 stressing the need for tighter financial control. The Vice-Chancellor in his reply stated that he was "acutely conscious of the fact that the accounting system was urgently in need of reform and that the irregularities pointed out in the Audit notes, year after year, merited serious attention".<sup>7</sup> In spite of the written assurances by the Vice-Chancellor, evidently nothing was done in the matter and the annual expenditure of the University, which had begun to rise rather sharply since 1951-52 (by nearly 41 per cent) and again more so since 1956-57 (by about 46 per cent) came to be more than 9 million rupees in 1958-59.<sup>8</sup>

At that stage the Ministry of Education of the Union Government asked the person nominated by the Visitor, the President of India, on the Finance Committee of the University to make a report on the financial position of the University. On the basis of the report submitted by the President's nominee and in the light of previous history "the Government concluded

<sup>7</sup> Report, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 24.

appointments in the University, academic or administrative, 300 and odd, in November 1960 occurred a case in contravention not only of the established procedure but also of the specific legal opinion the University had got regarding a particular procedure of appointing Selection Committees and which it had urged before the committee itself.<sup>10</sup> Another case was even more blatant. There was a move to bring about separation between the Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies, and the Institute of Islamic Studies, and the Committee had suggested to the Vice-Chancellor that there being no urgency in the matter the question "could well await the findings of our Committee on the general question of relationship between research and teaching". But the Executive Council had neither the patience nor the good grace and ordinary courtesy to wait, and it effected the division. The enquiry committee's reaction to this nonchalant behaviour of the University even in a matter of academic practice, and one, on which the report of the Visiting Committee appointed by the University Grants Commission on an identical issue in regard to another Department of studies had received that committee's unstinted approval, was the very mild wish, "We trust that the matter will be re-examined in the light of our observations". And this in spite of the fact that in the case where the University Grants Commission and its committee were involved the University only recently had acted in defiance of the scheme as approved by the University Grants Commission for its financial contribution! <sup>11</sup>

The Amending Act of 1951 threw open the gates of Aligarh University to non-Muslim students; and at the time the Enquiry Committee worked, it found that about one-third of the students at the University were non-Muslims. That does not mean that the University authorities had worked in the spirit which the Amending Act was inspired with, viz., of mixing together Indian nationals of the University-education-age as far as possible and prevent the segregation that was quite clearly the consequence of the earlier Aligarh practice.

Only about 8 months after the Report of this Enquiry Committee was published, the whole University was convulsed by what must be considered to be the worst and most callous form of communal hatred, tension, and violence through the barbarous activity of some Muslim students of the University against some Hindu students of it living on the campus in its hostel! On this we will have more in its chronological context.

The sullenly partisan attitude of the University was exposed to the committee by some witnesses. The relevant regulation of the University implementing the provision of the Amending Act about non-compulsion of the study of Muslim theology on those who did not want to study it, had prescribed an alternative course for those who took exemption from the course on Muslim Theology. The witnesses had stated that the alternative

<sup>10</sup> *Report, op. cit.*, pp. 99, 101.

<sup>11</sup> *Report, op. cit.*, pp. 133-4.

course was very difficult and the course in Muslim Theology was extremely elementary.<sup>12</sup> The committee also revealed the fact that even after 12 years of Independent India divested of Pakistan that the *undertaking of allegiance which the employees of the University had to sign "before" being confirmed curiously read: "I solemnly declare that I will not by my words or conduct do anything which is repugnant to the character of this University as a Muslim Institution"* and that it had come to be prescribed by the Court in 1940 "in circumstances which need no comment".\* It was the duty of the committee to narrate, however briefly, these circumstances in order that the readers of its report may follow their analysis of the situation and their suggestions for reform intelligently, but the tender-hearted committee desisted from it. And we can only surmise that it was the Muslim League stand of there being two nations in India, the Muslims being a distinct nation by themselves, a stand which was vigorously held by Aligarh dons and alumni. In another part readers will find the scheme of a new political set-up for the India of the British period which testifies to this. And what is worse is the committee's tepid remark, "We think this undertaking is out-moded". Well, with such a mild brushing it would be a pleasant surprise to find that the same undertaking or a similar one is not in force even to-day!

The committee<sup>13</sup> made one positive suggestion of great importance for the administration of the University and that was that the post of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor should be abolished as it was convinced that with the whole-time adequately paid Vice-Chancellor at the helm that dignity was not only superfluous but was also a cause for and a centre of conflicting loyalties and of divided control. It recommended the creation of the post of Rector with a fixed salary of Rs. 1500 a month with mostly advisory functions, more or less under the control of the Vice-Chancellor. In subsequent events, the great convulsion caused by the barbarous physical attack on the Vice-Chancellor of the University in April 1965, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor figures and that, too, in the party against the Vice-Chancellor but the Rector is conspicuous by his absence. I take it that the University set at naught the recommendation of the Enquiry Committee, though it was fully backed by the authority of the then Chairman of the University Grants Commission, which has under its control the distribution of the largess that an educational institute or an individual educationist can manage to secure in this country! If this is not intransigence and even truculence then nothing is such! Only frustration taking up a sullenly militant role for the furtherance of frustrated expectations into actuality can explain such a course of action.

Half of the editorial in the issue of *The Times of India*, from which I

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 129-30.

\* Italics mine.

<sup>13</sup> *Report, op. cit.*, pp. 101, 120-2.

have quoted some points above, is devoted to a comment on the observations of the committee on the character of the University, "The Muslim character and traditions" of Aligarh University. It is rather surprising that the committee should have gone out of its way to emphasize that the special character of the University as a Muslim and a minority institution remained intact and that the special character and "tradition" of it was not merely an asset to the Muslim world but was so even to the Indian nation. I say the committee has gone out of its way to do this because the three specific terms of reference framed for the committee to report upon do not contain one which should directly lead the committee to go into the matter. Two of the terms of reference are quite precise and concerned with the alleged irregularities in the matter of accounts and appointments. The third term which is slightly more general asks the committee "to suggest measures of reform necessary for the efficient functioning of the University". The reforms which the committee has suggested in its report are incapable of changing the character of the University. There was thus no appropriate occasion for going into the question of the origin of the University, the end the originator had in view and all such matters, bringing in even a judgment of the Supreme Court, all, as if on the one hand to allay the fears of the managers of the University and of the Muslim public, and on the other to silence the critics of the University. In between, the committee has thrown in sops in the form of high-sounding notions of academic freedom, national security, national integration, and of weighty opinions and answers of the then Chairman of the University Grants Commission and a little cajolery intended for the managers of the University.

I shall first briefly summarize the history of the University and the argument regarding the minority character of the University in spite of the Amending Act of 1951 which the Committee has presented.

The Muslim Anglo-Oriental College founded at Aligarh in 1877 by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and his co-workers for imparting education as a combined whole in modern studies and Islamic theology and learning had, by the time its founder Sir Syed died in 1898, come to occupy "a position of its own in the educational world of India". Sir Syed had "felt that his community [Muslims] interests required that it should keep itself aloof from the national movement and in this he was encouraged by his many British friends. . . . *In retrospect, one wishes that he had cooperated with the pioneers of the National Movement in their efforts to evolve a common Indian nationality. . .*"

In 1920 an Act passed by the Central Legislature established the University providing it with a Constitution which was only amended by the Act of 1951. It records its impression "that certain sectors of public opinion in India continue to believe that the atmosphere of the Muslim University,

<sup>14</sup> *Report, op. cit.*, pp. 110-2, 139. The words quoted are from the Report. Italics are mine.

Aligarh, is still vitiated by *the political anti-national ideology which characterised it in the decade preceding Independence*" and quotes as its authority for this statement the observation, or rather the finding, of the Radhakrishnan Education Commission (1948) viz., "The unfortunate incidents of the few years before the Partition caused a setback in its academic work." It also mentions the existence of "a lurking fear in some quarters that the Aligarh Muslim University might once again revert to *its former mood which accepted Partition on the theory of two separate nations*".<sup>15</sup>

It is clear from this way of stating the views that the committee had no doubt that Aligarh University was almost for a whole decade before Partition,—two of its Professors published their over-ambitious and one-sided schemes of the new political set-up in India on the basis of the two-nations theory, treating Muslims as a distinct nation, in 1938—a centre of anti-national ideology. But it lulls itself on the score of the possible continuation of the same atmosphere which in the opinion of the Radhakrishnan Commission, approved of by the committee, had caused a setback in the academic work of the Aligarh University, and attempts to stupefy the public with the grandiloquent wishful belief that "the political turmoils of the passing hours do not leave any imprint on the abiding page of history". Evidently the Committee had not followed or studied the situation and events of the political life and atmosphere in the country during the 15 years that had elapsed since the coming of the Simon Commission and the day of Independence! It had even forgotten or had managed to ignore completely the Muslim Convention, the first of its kind in Republican India, held at Aligarh in 1953, i.e., almost exactly in the year since when the financial and other irregularities in the University, which the committee was commissioned to enquire into, had begun, and the part Aligarh University Muslim students were alleged to have played in it. The committee apparently was unaware of the part played and the anti-national slogans alleged to have been uttered by Aligarh University Muslim students, resulting in the rustication of 8 of them, in the agitation carried on violently in 1956 against the book *Religious Leaders*!

If the committee had tried to apprise itself of these happenings before laying down its *obiter dicta*, strictly not called for by its terms of reference, it would not have easily laid the flattering unction to its soul and administered a dose of soporific to the public in the form of its remark: "With the attainment of Independence we have turned our back on many things." Just as we have not turned our back on "no-salt-tax" or on "charkha", so too, in even a greater measure, in the matter of "separatism", which is imbedded in the foundation and continuance of the Aligarh Muslim University and which cannot be effaced by an effort on the part of only one of the "we". Therefore the last was not said when Partition arrived and occurred, and

<sup>15</sup> *Report, op. cit.*, pp. 112, 119. Italics mine.

"we" have not turned "our" back!

The committee, in blatant contradiction of facts about the activities of and the general atmosphere at Aligarh University, prevailing during the decade 1951 to 1961, conjured up as incarnate what in actuality did not exist at all and patted the University on its back thus: "Muslim University, Aligarh, with its open-door policy of admitting *members of all communities and giving them opportunities to share fully in its residential and corporate life,*<sup>16</sup> *is in a specially privileged position to foster that emotional integration which is essential for the preservation of India's cultural and political unity. We have noticed with approval certain practical steps*"—whether practical or theoretical, what these steps were the committee has not deemed it necessary or desirable to reveal to the doubting world, of whose abundant misgivings and 'misunderstanding' it has shown itself to be 'painfully' aware—"which the University authorities have taken in this direction. We trust that this spirit will continue to prevail in all its policies and practices so that it may serve as a model for others to emulate."

How the supposedly factual observation and the fervently wishful trust of the committee were realized in actuality will be crystal clear when the reader goes through the brief account of the barbarous manhandling, with determined premeditation and long-laid plan, of one Vice-Chancellor who began to show himself to be sincerely and firmly nationalist, determined to put his nationalist ideas and ideals into the practice of the University, which occurred in April 1965! It is to alert the reader to this ironical concatenation of facts that the last italicizing in the quotation from the committee's report is made.

*The Times of India* editor's remarks on the nature and quality of the lucubrations of the committee on this aspect of its self-imposed task, which are spread over about 20 pages of the Report, are sufficient to expose their slipperiness. He observes: "It is in the context of the larger academic purposes that the Government must view the problem of the 'muslim character and traditions of Aligarh University. . .' The Committee feels that Aligarh should serve as a symbol of our composite culture and 'develop and emphasize' the study of the contribution made by Islam and the Muslim community to 'the complex character of our national culture'. But surely this contribution is worth studying and emphasizing at all our universities. In fact there is the danger that in a concentrated study of the subject at one university a distorted emphasis may come to be placed on Islam's contribution to the exclusion of a proper appreciation of the national culture,

<sup>16</sup> *Report, op. cit.*, p. 142. Italics mine. They are intended to remind the reader that, as observed above and fully explained in another chapter, within about nine months of this writing of the committee, the Aligarh University Muslim students behaved so brutally towards the non-Muslim students of it that 8 Muslim students concerned in the affair had to be expelled from the University. If they were re-admitted it is not known from the available source of information!

which it has enriched, and of the contribution made by other religious development”.

The last was not heard about Aligarh University when the learned editor of *The Times of India* complimented the Enquiry Committee on its mildly worded report, much less so when the latter had written out a testimonial to the good faith of the University authorities in its Report. In the elections held soon thereafter to the 3 vacant seats on the University's Executive Council from its Court on 23 April, the two non-Muslim candidates one of whom was P. N. Sapru, M.P.,—the more vocal and expressive of the two—who had differed from the findings and recommendations of the mild Enquiry Committee in a few places had lined themselves on the side of the University authorities, were defeated so that all the three seats were filled by Muslim Members (*Times of India*, 28-4-'61). To a correspondent's contention of previous practice of 'taking' at least one non-Muslim on the Executive Council, the Public Relations Officer of the University sent in a reply dated 8 May 1961 (*Times of India*, 11-5-'61). He stated that the first election to the Executive Council that was held after Independence was in 1949 when the five members elected were all Muslims and that it was only in 1957 that a non-Muslim was elected "for the first time". When that member resigned another non-Muslim was elected in his place in 1958. Anyway whether there was a practice or convention to have at least one non-Muslim member on the Executive Council or not the fact is that immediately after the University Enquiry Committee had appealed for integration and had expressed confidence and held high hopes of such being exhibited, the Muslim Court of the University reacted by declining to follow even the last precedent of having any non-Muslim contact in the executive body of the University! This must be interpreted to establish the desire of the Court of the University to keep the University as separatist as possible under the legal provisions.

In the news from Ernakulam, Kerala, which *The Times of India* issue of 8 May carried, once again one finds Mr Mohammed Ismail, whose amendments to the draft Constitution moved in the Constituent Assembly were defeated, and who had now continued his League activities in a reinvigorated manner as we have seen above, figuring. This time he came out with a form of disclaimer about the subdued revelation in the press of the Muslim League eschewing politics. He asserted on the other hand "the country had only been benefitted by the Muslim League joining with other democratic parties in Kerala during and after the last elections". In the next day's issue of the same paper appeared a letter from one Syed Mahamed of Bombay. He contended that the success of the Muslim League in the "recent" elections to the Bombay Municipal Corporation had alarmed the Congress so much that it had revived a move to have it banned as a communal organization even though the Law Ministry of the Union Government had opined that such a ban would be illegal under the Constitution.

Affirming that the League had owed its strength to the encouragement given by the Congress to the Kerala Muslim League for its political purposes, he endorsed the view of M. Harris—a progressive-looking nationalist-oriented Muslim leader of Bombay—expressed by him on 27 April that “it will be more appropriate for the Congressmen to shed their communal bias and become more selfless in their service of the nation”.

The same day's issue of *The Times of India* (9-5-'61) in a special advice from Kottayam, Kerala, flashed Mohammed Ismail's pronouncement that the League was a “national organization \* of the Muslims in India” and there was nothing communal about it. He was speaking at a conference wherein the President of the Kerala State Muslim League inaugurating it, spoke of “the democratic unity” brought about in the mid-term elections in the State and that “the League had fulfilled its promises and would continue to do so”. The conference passed a resolution expressing “concern over the Jabalpur incidents” and urging the Madhya Pradesh and Union Governments “to take necessary steps to afford relief to the victims and prevent such occurrences in future”.

The New Delhi news as of 12 May (*Times of India*, 13-5-'61) announced in one place that the report of the National Integration Committee appointed by the Congress under the Chairmanship of Indira Gandhi was likely to be discussed on 17 May by the Congress Working Committee which was going to consider “means of strengthening national unity by checking and eliminating the forces of disintegration, especially communalism”. In another place it flashed the information that “the special problems of Indian Muslims are likely [?] to be discussed at a convention scheduled to meet here in the second week of June”. It stated that invitations were to be issued to about 200 Muslims legislators and to an equal number of other prominent Muslims. It was further declared that “the resolutions to be adopted will be strictly within the limits of the Constitution”. The same news item conveyed the intriguingly interesting and instructive information that (1) the convention ensued from a resolution passed by the Working Committee of the Jamiat-ul-Ulama-i-Hind; (2) it was being called “in consultation with influential Hindu and Sikh sympathisers”.

The next day's issue of *The Times of India* gave its readers the information sent by its New Delhi news serviceman that top Government and Congress leaders appeared to be “clearly unhappy and disturbed over the Muslim convention proposed to be held in the second week of June to consider what are described as the peculiar problems of the community”. It was felt that “the proposed get together” was “likely to encourage the revival of the old Muslim League and its exclusive politics”. It was further being pointed out that though the convention might have ensued from a resolution of the Working Committee of Jamiat-ul-Ulama yet “it was being

\* Italics mine. Note the use of the adjective ‘national’, implying that in Ismail's view the Muslims in India are a ‘nation’ by themselves!



*held by the Jamiat in active collaboration with the fanatical Jamiat-e-Islami and the Muslim League in Kerala and elsewhere".(?)*

Before going further with the story of the convention I must acquaint the reader with these organizations Jamiat-ul-Ulama and Jamiat-i-Islami through a brief history of each.

Jamiat-ul-ulama-i-Hind, i.e., the Jamiat-ul-ulama of India was organized<sup>17</sup> by politically articulate religious leaders of the Muslims of India in 1919, the days of the Khilafat movement. From the beginning it was under the leadership of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and the Deoband seminary leaders and alumni. The Deoband School or Seminary<sup>18</sup>, whose "mentor" was Shah Waliullah Dehlavi, was founded in 1867. It is known as Daru-l-Uloom and is declared by W. C. Smith as "next to the Azhar of Cairo, the most important and respected theological academy of the Muslim world". Its prestige and its distinguished role in the Indo-Muslim community have been recognized. Malik informs us that the Deoband School was waiting for a war between Turkey and Britain to "sabotage the British power in India and paralyze her war efforts against Turkey". Its extra-territorial allegiance indicated by this attitude is said to have acted as a severe blow "to any reasonable hope for the merging of Moslems and Hindus in an Indian partnership".

This institute situated in Saharanpur District figured in the Vidhan Sabha debates of the U.P. in October 1961. It was alleged that five Pakistanis without valid visas had been admitted to the institution.<sup>19</sup>

The Jamiat-ul-ulama since 1922 worked alongside of the Congress. Yet in 1942 it supported the policy of Pakistan-conceding propounded by Raja-gopalachari; and its conference in the same year passed a resolution, which, demanding complete independence for India, asked also that a federal constitution suitable for securing "*religious, political and cultural self-determination for Muslims*" should be framed.<sup>20</sup> Maulana Hifzur Rahman, who was at its head in 1961 (*The Times of India*, 18-5-'61), had explained to W. C. Smith<sup>21</sup> in March 1956 that "the Muslims and non-Muslims" had "entered upon a mutual contract in India since independence, to establish a secular state" the Constitution of India being its document. Its chief organ is the Urdu daily *Al-Jamiyat* issued from Delhi, the headquarters of the organization.

Jammat-i-Islami is an organization which was founded by one Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi at Pathankot in 1941. Maudoodi was born in a Delhi

<sup>17</sup> W. C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, pp. 313, 323.

<sup>18</sup> Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *Deoband, School etc.* (1963), pp. 22-27. W. C. Smith, *loc. cit.*, pp. 320-1; *Islam in Modern History*, p. 75, fn., 59. He puts its career as beginning in 1876. The date given above is that of Malik, *loc. cit.* pp. 192-3.

<sup>19</sup> *The Times of India*, 17-10-1961, Uttar Pradesh Newsletter.

<sup>20</sup> W. C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, pp. 313, 333. Italics mine.

<sup>21</sup> *Islam in Modern History*, p. 285.

family at Aurangabad,\* Deccan, in 1903. His writings in the Urdu monthly journal which he conducted in Hyderabad, Deccan, attracted the attention of Sir Mahommad Iqbal who invited him to Pathankot in 1937 where he had endowed a retreat on a 65-acre piece of land. From Pathankot the headquarters of Maudoodi and his organization moved to Malihabad near Lucknow. Later its Indian branch was shifted to Rampur and finally to Delhi. The Jammāt holds India to be a Dar-ul-Harb, "Land of Infidels" and prescribes to its followers how to live in it as a true Muslim. W. C. Smith counting Jammāt-i-Islami of Pakistan and Razakar of Hyderabad (Deccan) along with Daru-l-Islam of Indonesia and Ikhwn-al-Muslimun of Arabia as "dynamist elements" in Islam tells his readers that these elements "at times" develop a violent fury and "rejoice in a bitter vehemence in opposition to the West, to local non-Muslims, to Muslims who disagree with them, and to all outsiders" combining "self righteousness with lust and power-hungry ambition".\*\*

Informing his readers that Jammāt-i-Islami of India maintains link with the same movement in Pakistan, Smith asserts that the group is "still [1957] able to arouse some [!] enthusiasm but surely little hope [?] on the basis of giving an essentially traditional religious content to the political and social attitude of the 'two nation theory'".<sup>22</sup> \*\*\* At the time Smith wrote his book, the chief organ of the organization was *Zindagi* issued from Rampur, which, readers should bear in mind was a Muslim State in British regime with a Nawab from an old Muslim family as the head of the State, and is located about 125 miles north-east of Aligarh. With Delhi-Aligarh line as the base and Rampur as the apex the three cities enclose almost an isosceles triangle.

To specify in greater distinctness the attitude that is desired to be engendered by the workers of Jamiat-i-Islami, I shall, with thankful acknowledgment to Hafeez Malik,<sup>23</sup> who has kindly made available through his book (English version), quotation from Maudoodi's work, published in 1947 at Pathankot, the following:

*The difference between these nations (Hindu, Moslem, etc.) are more deep-rooted than those found between the different cultural nationalities in Europe. Here one creed differs as much as the East from the West.*

\* I wish my readers to bear in mind this particular fact while appraising the account, very brief as it is under the circumstances of a policy of hush hush and garbling, that appears about the events of 1964 and also the great zeal shown by Dr Rafiq Zakaria, a Minister in Maharashtra Government, in establishing a college there named after Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

\*\* Italics mine.

<sup>22</sup> Malik, *op. cit.*, pp. 275-77; W. C. Smith, *Islam in Modern History*, pp. 90-1, 284-5; *Times of India*, 17-10-1961, Uttar Pradesh News letter.

\*\*\* Italics mine.

<sup>23</sup> *Moslem Nationalism in India and Pakistan*, p. 276. Italics mine.

*The principle of one culture are entirely different from those of another. There are wide gulfs between the systems of morals. There is little unity between the sources of tradition. Emotions and sentiments are mutually repulsive and antagonistic. The national type of one bears hardly anything common to that of another in general appearance.*

•

Another item of faith and directive of action of this organization as represented by Malik<sup>24</sup> is: "Moslems constitute the party of Allah because they have been charged by Him to fulfill the Divine Mission of making the entire world Dar-ul-Islam", i.e., the land of the believers in and the followers of Islam, and all countries not believing in and following Islam being dubbed Dar-ul-Harb, i.e., the land of infidels. In 1961 its supreme leader, "Amir-e-Hind" (?) was Maulana Abul Lais Islahi. The organization was then known to be "very influential in Aligarh University". Many teachers of the University were said to be its followers, the one of Theology having presided over a conference on religious education of Muslims held at Basti in 1959 under the auspices of that organization. The conference "*opposed the teaching of Hindi to Muslim children on the ground that allusions and allegories in Hindi literature offended against the revelations in the Koran*". The elections to the Aligarh University Students' Union show the Jammāt-i-Islami and the Communist-sponsored Students' Federation as equally balanced, having shared the presidentship and secretaryship of the Students' Union between them for six years before 1961. The adherents of the Jammāt-i-Islami in the University published (publish?) the two magazines, *Taamir* ("Construction") and *Muslim Thought*.<sup>25</sup>

Lal Bahadur Shastri,<sup>26</sup> answering certain charges made by Mr Mohamed Ismail in the Loka Sabha on 6 June 1962, is reported to have stated that Jamaat-i-Islami is an organization banned in Pakistan.

To resume the narration of sayings and doings of Muslim Indians I should start by noting that "the allegation that the Muslim community has been getting less than its share in the country's political, administrative and economic life" was stated to have been "recently investigated by a sub-committee of the National Integration Committee—under the chairmanship of no less a pure nationalist than Mrs Indira Gandhi, an ex-President of the Congress and a member of the Working Committee of the Congress—appointed by the Congress President and that its findings were negative, establishing utter lack of evidence to support such an allegation (*Times of India*, 14-5-'61).

On 16 May Mr Abid Ali, Union Deputy Labour Minister, as reported in *The Times of India* (17 May 1961) issued a statement on the proposed Muslim Convention (conference?). In it among other things he stated:

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 277.

<sup>25</sup> *Times of India*, 17-10-1961, Uttar Pradesh Newsletter. Italics mine.

<sup>26</sup> *Times of India*, 7-6-1962.

India is a secular [democratic?] State where every community has equal right to live and prosper. *If there have been lapses in upholding this principle, the way to correct the situation is to strengthen the hands of those who stand by it. It will be suicidal for the Muslims of India if they themselves drift away from the path of secularism and allow themselves to be driven into political isolation.* As free citizens of the Indian Republic, Muslims also are free to join any political party of their choice. *For nursing and enriching their social, religious and cultural heritage they can have a separate organization like any other community.* But by forming a separate political group they would be playing directly into the hands of those forces which are operating against national integration and are out to undermine the very basis of India's secular democracy. . . .

Abid Ali's statement ended with an appeal "to all friends" to desist from taking such steps as will lead to the formation of a Muslim political party.

The kind of allegations and the nature of agitation on their basis started by Muslim Indians since at least 1953 and culminating in 1961 in this proposal for calling a Muslim Convention in the very heart of the country,—under the very nose of the greatest protagonist of secularism and the staunchest opponent of Hindu communalism, in spite of the evident displeasure of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who in 1916 had threatened to bomb Bihari Hindus out of this world for their alleged barbarous and persistent attempt at the extirpation of Muslims of some localities—must remind those, who passed through that period or those who have read minutely about it, of the events of the decade 1937-1947.

In 1937 the first Congress Governments came into power in the various States then known as Provinces. Very soon thereafter allegations of discrimination, exclusion and even maltreatment of Muslims and of their interests were made. On the basis of these allegations certified to by the then Muslim League the theory of Two Nations was successfully launched by the Muslims. So, too, now in 1961 after the beginning made in 1953.

The statement of Abid Ali who, when issuing it, was a Deputy Minister in the Union Government, and, I think, sometime before was a Secretary of the Congress, issued after the Committee of the Congress-sponsored National Integration Committee had reported upon the allegations as not proved is such as to strengthen the feelings, and resolve of the Convention-minded Muslims to persist in it than to desist from it. I have italicized only those portions in the statement which directly support my interpretation. However, the whole statement, being based on pure self-interest of the Muslims, is an open invitation to them to go on vigorously with the agitational technique to secure, ostensibly and at the outset, a due share of everything, except duties and responsibilities towards the whole nation, without any thought of the country as a whole, though the bogey of some

parties other than Muslims disintegrating the nation is raised!

The musings in the Current Topics columns of (*The Times of India* 17-5-'61) recorded the following comment on the Convention: "For, it [the declared purpose of the Convention] seems to suggest that Muslims in India, irrespective of their political convictions and economic status, are a breed apart, beset with problems which are not common to the rest of the population."

On 18 May, the Working Committee of the Congress decided not to oppose the Muslim Convention and its session to be held on 11 and 12 June "following overnight moves and solemn assurances by some leading Congress Muslims about its nationalist and secular [?] character" (*Times of India*, 19-5-'61). To appraise the nature of the assurances and the Working Committee's attitude on their basis, I shall quote a sentence from the statement of the Congress President approved by the Working Committee:

In order to understand the purpose of the proposed convention and to remove doubts and misunderstandings we have discussed this matter with some of the sponsors of this convention. We understand that the main purpose is to help the people of India and the strengthening of the secular ideal of our State. Only such persons who accept these ideals and objectives are, we are told, to be invited to the convention.

A convention or conference, held under the auspices of Jamaat-i-Islami, whose creed and faith, from an authoritative source as given above, clearly are purely Islamic militant and non-accommodatively exclusivist, to profess the strengthening of secular nationalism and satisfy great leaders of practical viewpoint is a phenomenon which only political mysticism can understand!

*The Times of India* cartoon of 19 May 1961 depicted Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and other Congress "greats" standing in disappointment and amazement gazing at a lamb-skin-covered wolf, the skin carrying the caption Conference "To protect Muslim Rights" and the wolf-tail bearing the caption "communalism".

The previous (18-5-'61) day's issue of the paper had carried an editorial headed "Minorities" commenting upon the recommendations of the National Integration Committee. It began by expressing gratitude to it for showing "the good sense to reject the proposal for reviving communal quotas for governmental posts". This remark bears out my submission made above and quite often in this work elsewhere, that the overtly expressed objectives of allegations, deputations and conferences or conventions of Muslim Indians since 1953 are only the ostensible show-front. The real objective of all these endeavours, including the sayings and doings of the majority of the so-called nationalist Muslims, is to secure reservation of seats, posts, positions and economic areas for them not merely on

population basis but also with weightage in the long run!

*The Times of India*, on 20 May returned to the topic in its editorial criticizing the volte face of the Congress Working Committee regarding the proposed convention.

In the issue of *The Times of India* of 22 May, the editor returned to the subject again on having known the purposes of the proposed convention of Indian Muslims through the pronouncement of its convener, Maulana Hifzur Rahman. Maulana Hifzur Rahman was the leader of the Jamiat-ul-ulama, the pro-nationalist Muslim organization of Muslim divines. It may be noted that after the confabulations of the Working Committee of the Congress with Congress Muslims the more outspoken and uncompromising organization of Muslims in India, Jamaat-i-Islami goes into the background in the matter of the proposed convention! The very second sentence of the plain-speaking editorial reads: "Revealing a degree of candour remarkable for a politician, he [Maulana Hifzur Rahman] has stated that *the convention would have met whether the Congress High Command liked it or not*".\* Stating that he had met both the Prime Minister and the Congress President, Hifzur Rahman added that *no assurances of any kind have been given to the Congress High Command*.\*

The development had convinced the editor of what I have stated above to have been the real object of all these allegations, conferences and conventions since 1953. He observes:

The whole idea seems to be to form a massive pressure group to push forward the interests of the Muslim community irrespective of the consequences [to the country as a whole? ].

The editor naturally and rightly ridiculed the legislation that was then being hustled through for curbing communalism. He says:

... but the case of the Muslim convention is a fresh reminder of the limitations of the legislative approach to the problem of communalism. And after Mr Sanjiva Reddy's strange statement on the proposed Muslim convention, one cannot be certain that even the most hollow claims will not have the powerful support of the country's ruling party. We can however be certain that so long as the Congress itself tries to woo the block vote of this or that community, the communal cancer will continue to grow.

While the country was getting agitated over the proposed Muslim convention and was trying to digest the doses of integrative mixture the Congress National Integration Committee had concocted, from Lucknow

\* Italics mine.

flashed, in the issue of *The Times of India* of the same date as the one which carried the plain-speaking valuable editorial, the information, gathered by the official agency, regarding the persons, who were a little before arrested in U.P. and Delhi, for possession of illegal stocks of explosives, including gunpowder. It was revealed that the first seizure of illegal explosives was made at Sitapur on 24 February. A Muslim tobacconist was caught with 12 boxes of potassium chlorate which had been delivered to him by Messers Mehrotra Transport Company. The boxes contained 20 maunds and 13 seers of "highly explosive chemicals". The consignment was sent from Bombay by the sender under a false name. On 9 March the same tobacconist was caught with 13 more boxes which contained 23 maunds and 10 seers of potassium chlorate. They too had come from Bombay. The man was released on bail. A Muslim inhabitant of Bulandshahr was arrested in Delhi with a stock of bombs which were U.P. products. On 27 April the Delhi police came to Khurja, U.P., and seized 625 crackers from a Hindu, or at least a non-Muslim, shop. A Hindu or non-Muslim firm at Saharanpur was searched and 700 pounds of gun powder was seized from it. From Najibabad in Bijnor the police seized 184 crackers and a small quantity of potassium chlorate.

This information was retailed by the Deputy Home Minister in the Vidhan Sabha of U.P. He further denied that *the 5000 to 7000 Pakistanis, who were overlying in the State,\** were responsible for the smuggling of explosives.

Again for the next 3 months or more the proposed Muslim convention, its actual session and its aftermath of thought agitation came to the fore. Mr S. R. Kidwai, a Muslim from Delhi, in his letter of 24 May (*The Times of India*, 30-5-'61), pleased with Maulana Hifzur Rahman's clarification about the organization of the Muslim Convention quoted above, attributed the "confusion" that existed before it to "the statements of some nationalist Muslim M.P.s". And he exhorted his co-religionists and others, too, to support the convention thus:

Now that *the Muslim communalists and their organs have vehemently opposed the convention, the failure of secular-minded Muslim leaders to rally the Muslim masses on this occasion could be interpreted as a tactical victory for the communalist forces which are likely to exploit the frustrations of the Muslim community through emotional appeals based on religious fanaticism.\** Therefore, all non-communal parties should extend their whole-hearted support to the convention.

In the context of this appeal to all and of the commendations of "secular-minded Muslim leaders", the brief summary of the declaration, whether

\* Italics mine.

written or oral is not indicated, of "more than 60 nationalist Muslims" from all parts of the country that *The Times of India* news service flashed in the paper's issue of 31 May 1961, assumes for our purposes great significance. The views and grievances expressed therein and the problems specified in it reveal to us the "purely" nationalist ("secular-minded") Muslims' mind and its operation unadulterated by the adjustments they would have to make to "rally" and accommodate, or rather to woo "the Muslim masses" of Mr Kidwai's letter.

The "more than 60 nationalist Muslims" of the news declared, in the words of the reporter, that "*the Indian Muslims had not been enjoying full constitutional rights in various important walks of life since the dawn of freedom and birth of a secular democratic constitution.*" They further asserted that in spite of all "collective and individual efforts, both in and outside the Central and State legislatures, no substantial result has yet been achieved" and that the state of affairs "is causing a great anxiety and a general feeling of frustration among the Indian Muslims". The pressing need of the time according to these "more than 60 nationalist Muslims" is that prominent Muslim intellectuals, forgetting their differences, should get together and make a constructive attempt at finding "practical solutions" for the problems facing Muslims which should be "within the strict limits of our secular constitution". Further they were told that the time had come when the Indian Muslim should formulate "their *demand* in consonance with all their social, educational, linguistic, economic and *national needs* and submit them on the 'conscious basis' of national integration".

The problems needing the immediate and careful attention which were to be discussed at the convention as detailed in the declaration were:

1. to devise ways and means of enabling every citizen, while he enjoys full freedom to practise his respective religion and culture, to live in harmony with others and promote national solidarity in all respects;
2. to hold in check the forces [not specified!] that encourage communal passions resulting in heavy losses of human lives and properties;
3. to examine *how Muslims could get their due share* [how is this to be ascertained? The answer must clearly be in the long run "by reference to population proportions"!] *in all Government services and get proper representation in all local government organizations and State and Central legislatures*;
4. to find out ways by which *Muslims could get their due share* [Are 'shares' in trade and industry 'due' in terms of groups whether linguistic, religious, cultural or ethnic?] in the matters of *trade and industry* \* and all other national activities;
5. to find out ways of setting right text-books in some States which con-

\* Italics mine.



tain certain viewpoints unacceptable even from the secular point of view.

The month of June (*Times of India*, 1-6-'61) began with an announcement that the great and wealthy Muslim community of Bombay, Dawoodi Bohras, whose head His Holiness Dr Syedna Taher Saifuddin Saheb was the Chancellor of Aligarh Muslim University for many years, was to hold its convention in Bombay on 5 and 6 June, i.e., about a week before the proposed Muslim Convention was to meet in Delhi! Its proclaimed objective, however, was not only unobjectionable but even laudable to the extent that any activity undertaken in caste or communitywise manner can at all be laudable. The main subjects of discussion were declared at a press conference to be

1. measures to consolidate the educational advancement of the community;
2. to provide for vocational and technical instruction;
3. to explore possibilities of starting small-scale and cottage industries for members of the community;
4. to establish cooperative housing societies and
5. to launch a saving drive.

The same issue of *The Times of India* which gave the above news supplied the information that 40 Bihar Muslims, including members of the State Legislature and Parliament, will attend the proposed Muslim Convention at Delhi, the Convention now for the first time being described as "of nationalist Muslims" and not merely "of Muslims". It was further stated that Mr Abdul Qayum Ansari, the President of the Pradesh Congress Committee, will also attend it. With regard to the decision of the Reception Committee of the Convention to have Dr Syed Mahmud, M.P., as the President of the Convention, the news revealed that 18 Congress Muslim legislators of Bihar had issued a statement opposing Dr Mahmud's election to that post. Led by Shah Muhammad Umair, M.P., they rejected the claim of Dr Mahmud to be the spokesman of Bihar Muslims. Shah Umair further added his interesting "aside", duly conveyed to the Prime Minister, that the purpose of many people who had joined in for the convention was "merely to obtain Congress tickets for some 'self-styled Muslim leaders'" ! The elections were to take place in 1962.

On 2 June (*Times of India*, 3-6-'61) Fakhruddin Ahmed,\* the Finance Minister of Assam, then in Delhi, described the proposed Muslim Convention as a "very ill-advised move". He stated further that he would "certainly not attend it", and did not think that anyone else from Assam either would

\* Became a member of the Government of India in 1966.

attend. He said—evidently it was a press conference that Mr Ahmed was addressing—he was “*very strongly of the view that there should be no communal or sectional meetings. Any communal emphasis on the part of the community created an unhealthy reaction among other communities*”.\* However, as the Convention would be held, he expressed the hope that it would, without much ado, endorse the Report of the National Integration Committee and welcome the decision of the Government to implement its recommendations.

The All-India Dawoodi Bohra Convention, with 675 delegates from all parts of the country attending, began its session before a large gathering in Bombay at the Saifce Mosque on 5 June (*Times of India*, 5-6-61).

The *Times of India* issue of 10 June published its Delhi news-service-man’s announcement of 9th that the Muslim Convention would meet the next day at Sapru House with Dr Syed Mahmud as President and that nearly 600 Muslims were expected to attend the session at which “the sponsors were determined to find a solution of the genuine grievances” of the Indian Muslims *within the framework of the Indian Constitution* and in consonance with the basic spirit of national integration.

At this stage it is desirable to go into the accredited antecedents of Dr Mahmud who will be figuring in our study also later on.

I shall begin by stating that in the 1942 movement Dr Syed Mahmud was one of the great figures of the Congress. He was a member of the Working Committee of that body in the company of such men as Jawaharlal Nehru, Pattabhi Sitaramayya and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. Maulana Azad<sup>27</sup> informs us that he was with him in Ahmednagar gaol and that he was released in June 1944, to the surprise of Azad and others who were with him, ostensibly on the ground of ill-health. Azad observes: “I later came to know the real reason, but after the lapse of so many years, I do not think it necessary to go into the details of this unhappy incident.” After the elections of 1946 while helping the formation of a Ministry in Bihar, Azad discovered that some Bihar Congressmen had turned against Syed Mahmud after his release from Ahmednagar gaol and they had to be pacified to get Dr Mahmud a place in the Ministry. Azad says he succeeded in it. Dr Syed Mahmud became a member of the Bihar Government. It may be mentioned that Dr Mahmud and Asaf Ali were nominated to the Working Committee, for the first time I think, by Azad when he became the President of the Congress in 1939.

A pamphlet giving in full all the resolutions passed at the Convention was published by the Reception Committee. In general they reiterate, and that too with slightly greater emphasis and more volubility, the main resolutions passed by the Convention of 1953 at Aligarh. I shall quote here a few of them and the ones which I think were new or additional

\* Italics mine.

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 33, 95-6, 127.

ones:

(1) *"The administrative machinery of every State be so constituted that in every district the minorities may have a proper share in the administrative and executive set up."*\*

(2) "The Indian Muslims' Convention expresses its grave concern and regrets that a number of highly repressive tyrannical laws were passed about the evacuation of the property after the partition of the motherland and were rigorously enforced. The Indian Muslims had to suffer severe hardships and very many miseries on account of these inhuman and tyrannical laws during the last 11 years.

"The repressive and retaliatory enforcement of these inhuman laws deprived many Muslims of their properties despite the fact that they were the full-fledged citizens of the Indian Union. In addition to the private property, their mosques, grave-yards, Imam Baras, tombs and religious endowments were improperly and illegally declared evacuee property. It is still more regrettable that numerous places of worship and mosques were put to auction and this greatly shocked the Muslims.

(3) "In accordance with article 16 of the Constitution of India, no citizen can be deprived of Government service, on the basis of religious discrimination, but the Indian Muslim Convention feels with deep sense of regret that at all levels in Government and semi-Government services Muslims have only a nominal representation. This discriminatory attitude is not only violative of the Constitution but, tantamounts to discomtenancing secularism. Therefore, the Indian Muslims' Convention forcefully demands from the Union and the State Government that:

(i) "On the Central and State level all such causes and conduct, he got duly investigated as are responsible to deprive the Muslims of recruitment in higher Civil and Police and Defence services specially and lower Grade Government services in general despite possessing the requisite ability and merit.

(ii) "On the Central and State level such conventions be established as to make it possible for Muslims to obtain proper representation in higher and lower Government services.

(iii) "Just as in the case of scheduled castes, officers have been appointed to see to the proper representation in services similarly the Government should appoint officers who should submit half yearly report regarding representation of the Muslims and other minorities in services.\*\*

\* Italics mine. The wording is that of the pamphlet which is adhered to though it is sometimes incorrect in expression.

\*\* Readers may be informed that Article 292, in the draft Constitution, prepared before the events of late 1947 and 1948, had laid down such a provision for all so-called minorities. But later on the whole scene changed and Muslims, Christians and Sikhs as minorities did not exist and the provision was dropped out!

"It is an acknowledged fact that after 14 years of Independence Muslims who are an important minority of India *are being kept backward in economic field* under well planned scheme. Such circumstances have developed in cottage industries, factories and other spheres of economic activities that it is not possible for the Muslims to make progress in this field. It has become very difficult for them to obtain loans and subsidies either from Government or Cooperatives.

(4) "Muslims who belong to the business class and who enjoy established position on account of their experience and standing in the trade, should be appointed or nominated as exporters, importers, brokers and agents in big companies, factories and establishments under public sector.

(5) "This Convention demands that the Central Directorate of Education and the Directorates of Education of the States should *issue a clear proclamation to recognize all those private schools and madrasas, which have made regular arrangements for imparting secular education along with religious education, on this one condition that the standard of education in them should be up to the mark specified by the Government.\**

*"This Convention also demands that a proper declaration should be made to exempt all children receiving education in these maktabs and madrasas from being forced to attend Government schools;\**

(6) "It is an obvious fact that the attitude of the Directorates of Education regarding the text-books has been quite unsatisfactory and a cause of complaint for the Indian Muslims. Very frequently the text-books have been found to contain portions grievous and intolerable for the Muslims. Therefore, to redress this grievance, the Indian Muslim Convention demands of the Central Government and the State Governments to take care that no book included in the curriculum contains matter superimposing the religious beliefs of any particular community or distorting the beliefs, traditions and history of any community. This convention also feels necessary that any lesson dealing with the beliefs, religious customs or history etc., should be included in a textbook only after it has been approved by an institution of the relative community.

(7) "This session of the Indian Muslim Convention expresses its concern that while all the State languages are being given opportunities of progress and development since the independence, and interest is being shown in their propagation, Urdu has not been given even its fundamental constitutional right. This representative session of the Indian Muslims therefore demands that

(a) in all those regions where, by article 347 of the Indian Constitution, the All-India Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu had demanded the recognition of Urdu as a regional language, it should be given the status of

\* Italics mine.

secondary regional language.

(b) the demands of the All-India Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu for facilities to Urdu in non-Hindi speaking areas should be met with immediately. These areas should be included in the institute book and given legal sanction for Urdu. A directive from the President of Indian Republic should be issued in this regard just as was done to make English an associate language.

(8) "This session of the *Indian Muslim Convention* makes its forceful demand from the national government to set up an Urdu University in some suitable place.\* Urdu is one of the 14 languages recognized by the constitution, and is one of those tongues which is a matchless legacy of the fusion of different cultures in our country. The advancement of Urdu in the wake of the establishment of an Urdu University will indeed prove helpful in strengthening those traditions of unity and concord which are being made the basis of national integration in all parts of the country and which will ultimately deepen the roots of solidarity. This Convention hopes that this reasonable demand of the Urdu-loving citizens will be granted and a declaration for setting up an Urdu University in the country will be made soon.

(9) "The importance of regional languages has much increased due to the formation of States on the basis of languages. Now these languages would be used for administrative and official purposes. The Secondary Education in which technical education would have a special place would also be imparted in these languages. The possibility of the higher University education being given in regional languages is also there and they may also be declared the language for courtwork up to the High Court stages. Under these circumstances, this Convention appeals to the Muslims of India that they should give more attention to Hindi and regional languages and they should try to gain mastery over them so that they may not lag behind in the field of education and progress.

"Besides, this Convention appeals to the Muslims residing in different states to try to produce enough literature for religious institutions for their children in the regional languages.

(10) "The Indian Muslims' Convention strongly feels the necessity of a Daily English Paper which could represent the interests of the nation and the country from the Muslim point of view."

I have to bring to the notice of my readers a feature of the session of this Convention of so-called Nationalist and Congress Muslims,—a feature, which, to judge from oral reports and personal impressions, appears to be more or less common with all meetings or institutions presided over or

\* Italics mine.

conducted by Muslim Indians, and to request them to bear it firmly in their minds. And that is that not only were the proceedings opened with recitations from the Quran as it was proper to do but also with the singing of Iqbal's song *Hindustan Hamara* (*Times of India*, 11-6-1961) and *not the national anthem 'Jana gana' etc. of India* for whose integrity and national integration these nationalist Congress Muslims passed more than one resolution!

The learned editor of *The Times of India* penned an editorial on this Convention under the heading "The Communal Danger" in the issue of the paper of the 13 June. In his view what matters most "in a communal gathering of this nature is the chain of action and reaction it sets in motion". And he thought that "the chain set in motion in this case cannot but do grave injury to the cause of national unity". That this opinion of the editor was shared by the organizers and sponsors of the Convention appears to be probable through their insistence in so many resolutions in one way or another on national integration and unity! But such resolutions are a mere nothing when placed in juxtaposition with the positively hypercritical and compulsive ones, centred on the narrow self-interests of the Muslim community and moved in an atmosphere where the very visible emblems of national integrity, the singing of the national anthem and the hoisting of the national flag, are conspicuous by their absence, and where their place is taken by a song written by a Muslim, who was one of the principal architects of the partition of pre-Republican India!

My comment at this stage on the endeavour of nationalist Congress Muslims in getting together their Convention and the particular resolutions is that whatever else it may or may not lead to, it certainly, in the words\* of the editor of *The Times of India*, "*far from stealing the thunder of the extremists, will in fact encourage the rank communalists to organise their own platform from where they can further inflate the demands of the community*". I should add to these wise words a rider that it will enable them to do so, i.e., inflate the demands, at a proper time as an old and moderate demand long unattended to.

July brought the apparently welcome news and the seemingly right reaction of the Muslim Convention that some prominent leaders of the Muslim League in Kerala had suggested that the League ceasing its political activities should turn itself into a purely social organization. The sponsors of the move, among whom figured both members of the State legislature and outsiders, suggested that in furtherance of this move the Kerala League should sever its connections with the All-India Muslim League and that its members should be permitted to join any political party they choose (*The Times of India*, 18-7-'61).

\* Italics mine.

## CHAPTER

## 12

### SOME THOUGHTS AND ACTIONS OF MUSLIM INDIANS (II)

If then, we do not think that differing necessarily means fighting, even when two desues both claim right of way, if we think that integration is more profitable than conquering or compromising, the first step towards this consummation is *to bring the differences into the open*.\*

MARY PARKER FOLLETT

AS MENTIONED IN the last chapter Aligarh University, which occupied the centre of public attention at the very beginning of 1961,—which year I have described as the worst ever year for Hindu-Muslim riots,—with the publication of the Report of the Aligarh University Enquiry Committee, came again to the forefront later in the year with the unprecedented activity—highly condemnable in an educated group—of rioting against the non-Muslim students of the University with such ferocity and poisonous aim that it started off a chain of Hindu-Muslim clashes almost all over U.P. A brief account of this aspect is presented in the Chapter, “Hindu-Muslim Riots”. It is not proposed to repeat anything of that, though it ought to be fully borne in mind while reading and appraising the repercussions on purely academic and organizational side of the University, which alone form and can form the subject-matter in this chapter. The Muslim students of Aligarh University in a body attacked some non-Muslim students at dead of night in the hostel of the University of 2 October 1961, and thus let off what proved to be a chain reaction in which, too, they were alleged to have been actively involved.

Only 6 or 7 weeks before these unfortunate and most unseemly occurrences on the campus of the University, the affairs of the University had come in for a public look in the Loka Sabha, apropos of the Report of the Enquiry Committee which was laid before the House in April and was being moved by four members for being considered! On 11 August the Union Education Minister, Dr K. L. Shrimali, in the course of the debate,

\* Miss Mary Parker Follett, *Dynamic Administration* by Metcalfe and U-wick, p. 36.

"repeatedly underscored the Government's determination not to allow academic freedom to impair cent per cent loyalty to the country and the Constitution". The discussion is reported to have brought out "a gloomy picture of the University administration and apart from the endeavour of a few members to refute wild allegations, there was very little to relieve the tone. *The Education Minister added a warning that unless the University set its house in order, the Government would have to take measures to check maladministration, inefficiency and misuse of funds.*" \*

It is necessary to note, in view of the later developments, that Dr Shrimali assuring the Loka Sabha that the Report of the Inquiry Committee would be treated by Government as if it were the Report of a Visitor's Committee, i.e., of any committee the President of India in the capacity of Visitor of Aligarh University can appoint to enquire into the affairs of the University, told the House that "the record of Aligarh University had not been glorious before independence and *called for efforts to build a new tradition*". He assured the House further that "*if any one could cite a single instance of discrimination against Muslims by any University, the Government would immediately stop its grant to the offending university*". During the debate Dr Shrimali vouchsafed the intriguing, nay incriminating (?), information that *a professor belonging to Jamaat-i-Islami which had been preaching--* readers will remember what has been stated above from authoritative sources about the ideals of this organization--*the "dangerous ideology" of establishing a theocratic State in India, had recently been appointed by the university.*\*\*

It is interesting and instructive to turn to the observations of Maulana Hifzur Rahman, about whose Muslim Convention of June 1961 I have said so much above, pointing out or merely suggesting *inter alia* that the ultimate end of all that kind of activity is nationally disruptive, making Muslims the central source of it as an exclusive and separatist community. The Maulana is reported to have said that "the allegations made by Prakash Vir Shastri were absurd. . . All that the inquiry committee had found out was that there were some technical irregularities in the university administration" and asserted that "such 'baseless allegations' against Aligarh University would affect the process of national integration and must be opposed" (*Times of India*, 12-8-'61).

The behaviour of the Aligarh Muslim University students on 2 October came in for a sharp rebuke from no less a person than the former President of India. Dr Radhakrishnan, who was then the Vice-President of India and the Chancellor of Delhi University, inaugurating the Indian Conference of Social Work in Delhi in 6 October 1961, is reported (*Times of*

\* Italics are mine and are intended to draw the reader's attention to the need of remembering the contents while appraising the situation about the University as it developed in April-August 1965.

\*\* All italics are mine.



*India*, 7-10-'61) to have "devoted a major part of his address to denounce strongly the communal clashes in Aligarh" which he declared had "filled us all with sorrow and shame". Pointing out the very recent holding of a conference on national integration he observed that the incidents in Aligarh showed "how distant the goal is". He is reported to have said that "if elections to the University Union could bring about such disturbances then 'what is going to happen in the general elections'. It was a 'warning to all of us' to be extremely careful and see that 'we should not behave in an improper and indecent way' even if we lost an election. It was a matter of shame that educated students, irrespective of community, could 'degrade' themselves and indulge in 'indecent behaviour towards their fellow-students'."

Dr Radhakrishnan is reported to have observed further that "the University (of Aligarh) which had done great work in the past and was expected to do great work in the future, '*should rethink the fundamentals of education and try to find out how human beings could be made to behave like human beings, to one another*'. That was '*the most urgent thing they have to do*'." \*

The same day's issue of *The Times of India* gave its readers its news report from Aligarh, where on 6 October the Chief Minister of U.P. with some other Ministers had gone to see for himself the situation and to meet the Vice-Chancellor, Colonel Zaidi. The report says that the Vice-Chancellor expressed "distress" at the incidents which "he attributed to the block-voting in the elections to the students' union". I fail to understand how block-voting or any voting could cause University students of one "community" (religious faith) to organize an avenging party, to lead it at dead of night, to force entrance into another part of the University hostel, and to beat brutally some sleeping students, who happened to belong to another community (religious faith) and to be their competitors in the elections held earlier in the day!

The Vice-Chancellor is then reported to have delivered a piece of wisdom after the event, which has so far never been put into practice! He is reported to have said that elections on a communal basis are highly objectionable, adding that he was extremely sorry to find that "his boys, who have always maintained the best relations among themselves, have been brought into this trouble". As a matter of fact it was the Vice-Chancellor's "boys" that had created the trouble and no exterior agency had created the situation for them to join in!

While the country was agitated over Aligarh riots, and as shown in another chapter, the whole of U.P. was to be presently in the grip of the most pernicious of chain reaction riots known so far from down South in Hyderabad, the erstwhile centre of Urduism and of Islamic domination

\* Italics mine.

over India, came the news that on 8 October the famous protagonist of the continuation and rejuvenation of the Indian Union Muslim League, Mr Mohammed Ismail, had asked the Andhra Pradesh League Organizing Committee to make arrangements for holding the All-India Muslim League Conference at Hyderabad and that a seven-man-committee with Mr S. M. Asaf Ali as its Chairman was appointed to do so.

On October 10, *The Times of India* gave a double notice to the affairs of Aligarh University, the editor in his editorial "Aligarh and After" mentioning Aligarh's role in the chain riots of U.P. and enlarging upon it, and Prem Bhatia, later our Ambassador to Uganda, contributing a special article headed "Prospect and Retrospect. Challenge of Aligarh".

Bhatia opened his recapitulatory and prospecting contribution with the sentence: "Aligarh has posed the first serious challenge to the efforts for national integration, but the incidents in the University and their sequel also emphasise a valuable moral." Further elaborating his view Bhatia observes: "*To start with it seems to be necessary now to have a deeper probe into the affairs of Aligarh University than was conducted a few months ago.*" The reference is, of course, to the Report of the Inquiry Committee which I have summarised and briefly commented upon above. He continues:

*Let us at last face facts. There is a widespread belief that this University is the hotbed of communal reaction, that it is influenced in its day to day working by Mullahs of the Jamaat-i-Islami and that at least some of the staff have undesirable contacts with Pakistan. It has even been said that the draft of the presidential speech at the recent Muslim Convention in New Delhi was vetted by elements at the University who are considered sympathetic to Pakistan.\**

About Colonel B. H. Zaidi Mr Bhatia wrote that there was "a strong feeling in New Delhi that he did not prove himself upto the task which faced him preceding the riotous conduct by the students". Mr Bhatia mentioned the name of Mr A.A.A. Fyzee of Bombay— I think he had just then retired after having been first a member of the Union Public Service Commission and then having served the Kashmir University as its Vice-Chancellor for a full term, and was thus appropriately available for a third run of public service—as having been on the Government list to take the helm at Aligarh University to be vacated by Colonel Zaidi.

The editor naturally wrote more on the chain riots than on the University affairs and tendered "valuable advice" to the Prime Minister thus: "He would do well to complete the formation of the National Integration Council so that it can meet and try to answer the challenge implicit in the

\* Italics mine.

events of the past week." (?) His idea of meeting the challenge, is more or less clear from a later editorial of his (6-7-1961), in which he observes, apropos of the Hindu Convention proposed to be held in September:

Some of the speeches made at the Muslim Convention were no doubt designed to deepen the discontent among the main minority community. But however ill-advised they may have been, it is only neurotic fear which can see in them "a deep-laid conspiracy . . ." To question the national loyalty of those who speak on behalf of one-tenth [more than one-ninth?] of the country's people is to betray an utter lack of faith in the very unity of the nation.

If Mr Bhatia called in question the national loyalty of the Jamaat-i-Islami in his contribution of 10 October only 4 or 5 days later, the Home Minister of U.P., in his rejoinder to the statement of the redoubtable leader of the Jamiat-ul-ulema, Maulana Hifzur Rahman, whose utterances in the Loka Sabha have been briefly extracted above, "charged" the Jamiat-ul-ulema with "fostering isolationism among Muslims". He further asserted that "*it was 'psychologically' impossible for Jamiat members to work for national integration as the organisation had appointed itself the guardian of the political and religious interests of one community*"\* (*Times of India*, 15-10-'61).

Earlier at a press conference on 10th the same responsible person had mentioned the Jamiat-ul-Ulema as one among the half a dozen organizations, which according to him "were fostering 'exclusivism' among Muslims". He further maintained a general principle of high value which, in the words of *The Times of India* news-serviceman, is stated thus:

Whatever Maulana Hifzur Rahman or others may say, once an organisation undertakes to guard the interests of one community alone, it is psychologically impossible for its members to work for national integration. As a matter of fact, *it is clear from the speeches delivered* at the various functions that some of the Jamiat workers and leaders regard the minority community as an entity apart from the Indian nation.\*\*

The highly valued and abundantly informative Uttar Pradesh newsletter appearing in *The Times of India* on 17 October 1961, which I have drawn upon more than once by now, mentions 9 Muslim organizations working

\* Italics mine.

\*\* Italics mine. Mark particularly the last few words which support my submission that all the conferences, all the allegations about injustice to Muslims in India tend to the one slightly remote objective of maintaining, as was done in the decade 1937-1946 by the then Muslims of British India, that Muslims in India are a nationality by themselves!

in U.P. for Muslims and Muslim exclusivism. They are: Jamaat-i-Islami, Jamiat-ul-Ulema, Muslim Jamaat, Jamaat-i-Raza-i-Mustafa or Makaz-i-Jamaat Raja-i-Mustafa Bareilly, Tabligh Islami, Sunni Jamiyat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind, Anjumani-i-Islami, Muslim League and Khaksar organization.

In the issue of *The Times of India* of 18 October appeared a letter dated 14 October addressed to the editor from Delhi by Mohammed Yusuf, General Secretary of Jamaat-i-Islami-Hind—it is rather surprising and intriguing that the letter should have received so prompt a forum from the authorities of the paper. In it Mr Mohammed Yusuf disclaimed the allegation of the fostering of exclusivism by Jamaat-i-Islami—I am not aware that any other of the “half a dozen Muslim organizations working on the religious, social and cultural planes” and “fostering an attitude of isolation among the Muslims” voiced a similar dissent through the columns of the paper—and concluded his letter with the sentence: “At the same time we feel that any attempt at absorption in the name of unity is against the Constitution of India and will prove injurious to national development.”

The echoes of the role played by the students of Aligarh University in starting and nurturing of communal riots continued long as will be clear from another part of this work. Here I should like to note a few of them as they emerged more or less immediately and from non-Governmental and non-Congress sources and from some sources within the University itself.

To begin with the latter, the non-Muslim (?) students of the University asked the Vice-Chancellor and the district authorities for guarantees against atrocities of the kind perpetrated against some of them by the Muslim students on 2 October, before agreeing to return to their classes in the University after their token strike, on 22 October (*Times of India*, 23-10-'61). On 27th Mr A. M. Khwaja, the Chancellor of the nationalist Muslim University, Jamia Millia Islamia, and a member of the Executive Council of Aligarh University, was reported to have given notice of a motion to be discussed at the next meeting of the Executive Council calling upon the Vice-Chancellor, Colonel Zaidi, to resign “immediately” (*Times of India*, 28-10-'61).

The committee of inquiry set up by the Praja Socialist Party to report on the communal disturbances gave its report on 21 October (*Times of India*, 22-10-'61). It opined that Aligarh University authorities were guilty of “negligence” during the election to the students’ union, as *the pre-election campaign was conducted on “naked communal lines”*. It further asserted that when an attempt was made to take out a “funeral procession” of the defeated candidates, notwithstanding the protests from them, the Proctor did not come out to prevent the same. It concluded that “*all is not well with Aligarh Muslim University*” and added that “*the University authorities did not cooperate with the district administration in countering the rumours which had been spread about the death of students belonging to one community.*” The chairman of the Committee Mr. Sharma said to

the pressmen :

*The management of the university is in the hands of persons whose outlook is anything but progressive and secular. Even liberal Muslims with a secular outlook feel suffocated in the present climate of the university. The Vice-Chancellor seems to find himself helpless.\**

On 29 October (*Times of India*, 30-10-'61) about 200 Muslim representatives from various districts in Madras and Andhra Pradesh met in Madras and decided to "part company" with the League leader, Mr Mohammed Ismail. They decided to rename their organization as All-India [?] Muslim League and to confine its activities "principally to the promotion of the religious, cultural, educational and economic interests" of the Muslims in India "giving up direct parliamentary activities". The conveners of the meeting were all members of the Council of the League. They appointed a 15-member sub-committee to frame a constitution for the All India Muslim League with Mr Raza Khan as convener and "elected Mr M.S.A. Majid as president of the Madras State Committee. Nothing was later heard about this; at least I have nothing at all in my collection to enable me to say anything about the developments in the next year.

Late reverberation of the Aligarh affair was heard in the Loka Sabha in connection with the many motions of adjournment which had been tabled to be discussed on 20 November. Mr Anathasayanam Ayyangar, the Speaker, while disallowing the motions suggested to the Government that an "independent committee" to inquire into the communal happenings in Aligarh Muslim University should be constituted (*Times of India*, 21-11-'61). The Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, is reported to have stated that there was no need for such a committee in view of the inquiry already held and that it was the intention of the Education Minister, Dr K. L. Shrinani, to bring forward "some legislation, keeping in view the report of the last committee and other matters".

In the beginning of 1962 Dr Syed Mahmud, who six months before not only had guided the deliberations of the Muslim Convention, second of its kind in Republican India, delivered his presidential address to a social conference of Orissa Muslims in Cuttack, characterized by the editor of *The Times of India* as "deplorable". The leading article under that heading appearing in the issue of the paper of 13 January 1962, held up Dr Mahmud's address "as an example of what should not be said by any responsible politician who wishes to promote national integration". The editor further added :

*To ask any community as a whole to vote for this or that particular*

\* Italics mine.

*party is quite plainly communalism of the kind that has done cruel damage to the country in the past and which is hampering national integration today.\**

On 6 June 1962, i.e., two days after the meeting of the National Integration Council, Mr Syed Badrudduja, whom we encountered as the President of the first Muslim Convention after Independence which met at Aligarh in 1953, made a speech in the Loka Sabha which is characterized as "the most violent communal speech ever made on the floor of the Indian Parliament since independence" (*Times of India*, 7-6-62). Mr Mohammed Ismail, the President of the Muslim League, appears to have furnished the cue. For Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri the then Home Minister, in his reply next day, "deplored this campaign of communal hatred and bitterness unleashed by Mr Mohammed Ismail, President of the Muslim League, yesterday and Mr Badrudduja today".

One month after this, Mr A. A. A. Fyzee addressed a Rotary Club meeting. In his speech divulging the fact that the report of the Emotional Integration Committee was ready to be handed over to the Government, Mr Fyzee indulged in some rather curious observations, after declaring his discovery that "there was a potentiality for unity in the country", and warned his audience that "real unity could not be achieved overnight". One of his observations was that "*the senseless and superficial repetition of the slogan of India's rich spiritual and cultural heritage\*\**" would not work. Another observation of Mr Fyzee as reported is that "the trouble" of linguistic separatism "started with the 'Radhakrishnan report'," [The report of the University Commission with Dr Radhakrishnan, then Vice-President of India, as its Chairman]. The invariable burden of the song in the speeches of Muslims in India, i.e., deprecation of questioning the loyalty of the minorities, was still another of the observations of Mr Fyzee (*Times of India*, 6-7-1962).

Mr Fyzee figured again in the news two months after his pronouncement on emotional integration recorded above as Mr Asaf A. A. Fyzee (*Times of India*, 8-9-62). At the annual general meeting of the Islamic Research Association of Bombay, Mr Fyzee as its president "made a plea on Friday for a central commission to inquire into the causes that led to the decline of the study of Arabic and Persian in India" arguing that "if the Government could appoint a commission for Sanskrit a similar consideration could weigh with Arabic and Persian as well".

At this stage it is necessary to be acquainted with the antecedents of

\* Italics mine.

\*\* Italics are mine but the words being in inverted commas are evidently those of Mr Fyzee himself and not of the Staff Reporter of the paper like the others put above within inverted commas,

Mr Fyzee in order to be able to appraise his championship of Arabic and Persian particularly in the manner in which he espoused it. Mr Asaf A. A. Fyzee, whose profession was that of an advocate, was for some years the Principal of the Government Law College, Bombay. He was a member of one of India's early delegations to the UNESCO. He was India's first Ambassador to Egypt. He was for some years a member of the Union Public Service Commission. He was Vice-Chancellor of Kashmir University. After relinquishing the office of the Vice-Chancellor he was a member of at least two Committees appointed by the Union Government, one of which was the Emotional Integration Committee. And at the time of this championship of Arabic and Persian as on a par with Sanskrit—the two languages, Arabic and Persian do not figure anywhere in the Constitution of India, while Sanskrit is not only listed as one of the 15 languages of the country in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution but is also specified as the source or mother language for the vocabulary of the national-language-to-be, Hindi, in Article 351—Mr Fyzee was due to leave for Cambridge as a Commonwealth Fellow. That a lawyer of such long and successful administrative and diplomatic career should forget or ignore the Constitution of his country, only proves that Mr Fyzee, though an Indian, primarily thought and perhaps thinks, as a Muslim, whose culture is Islamic, and not as a Muslim Indian.

In the pursuit of a purely passionate championship, Fyzee, the intellectual, even forgot or ignored or at least wrongly emphasized history when he said, as he is reported to have done, that Arabic and Persian “had been cultivated in India for over 1000 years by 45 million people” and that “several Indian scholars had employed these languages for writing classical prose and poetry”.\*

As for Arabic and Persian having been cultivated in India for “over 1000 years” the exaggeration adds about four to seven centuries during which there was the probability of the two languages having been cultivated. Al-Beruni, the conscientious and meticulous Muslim student of things Indian, writing in about A.D. 1050 does not refer to any Arabic or Persian as being studied in India. Amir Khusrāu, who died at Delhi in A.D. 1325, is almost the earliest Indian whose Persian poetry gets an honourable mention in the history of Persian poetry. Aziz Ahmad, a Pakistani Muslim, holding a high academic position, that of Associate Professor of Islamic Studies in the University of Toronto, in his book *Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, (1964), devoted a whole section of about 12 pages to describe the Muslim-stream of Persian Literature, and another of less than 5 pages to examine the Hindu contribution to Persian literature. But he does not speak of Indian Muslim contribution to Arabic literature anywhere. True, it was Mas'ūd Sa'd Salman that is the earliest of Persian poets east of the

\* Italics mine.

Indus. But he was a native of Lahore.<sup>1</sup> And hardly can Mr Fyzee, who is a citizen of India (Bharat) and not of British India, be expected to look upon him as an Indian contributor!

Two months after Mr Badrudduja's venomous outburst in the Loka Sabha was reported the considered view of the Jamaat-i-Islami, which in its frankness is laudable but in its context ruinous. Mr Aba Lais and Mr Mohammed Yusuf representing the organization before the National Integration Committee in New Delhi on 4 August 1962, and speaking in Urdu—note this attitude and behaviour of these Muslim Indians according to whose Constitution Hindi is the Official Language and English continues to enjoy that status as an associate—told Mr Asoka Mehta that "*religion and politics cannot be separated*" and that "*in the event of an eventual conflict between the claims of religion and country those of one's religion would take precedence*" \* (*Times of India*, 5-8-'62).

About the middle of October 1962 Aligarh University and indirectly its affairs came into the public view again with the appointment of the new Vice-Chancellor and his taking charge of his onerous post (*Times of India*, 13-10-'62, leading article entitled "Aligarh University").

The new Vice-Chancellor was Mr B. F. H. B. Tyabji, a retired civilian hailing from a well-known Bombay Muslim family. Evidently either Mr Prem Bhatia's information was wrong or his boosting of Mr A. A. A. Fyzee was not strong enough to place Mr Fyzee on the chair. In view of this feature and of the dissatisfaction created in the minds of the authorities that determine these matters, it is quite necessary to go into the antecedents of Mr B. F. H. B. Tyabji in order that we may appropriately appraise the great endeavour of the Union Government towards rectifying the unhealthy state of affairs prevailing at the University.

Mr Tyabji has kindly obliged us in this task by providing the material conveniently in his book *Chaff and Grain*, which is a collection of articles, essays or addresses, most of which were published or delivered "over a long stretch of years" as he himself avers in his preface written on 5 November 1961. From actual acknowledgements made in the book it is not possible to definitise the period, as in some cases there are no acknowledgements and in some others even the year is not mentioned. From what indications I can gather from the body of the writings itself I think that the earliest of them belonged to the year 1943 and the latest, as attested by Mr Tyabji's dates, to 1960 (17 October).

Mr Tyabji having risen upto the post of Commonwealth Secretary in 1952-53 and having represented India in Indonesia thereafter, at the time he published his book had retired from his office of India's Ambassador to Bonn (West Germany). Later he was India's Ambassador to Tokyo (Japan), which position evidently he came to occupy more or less immediately after

<sup>1</sup> Hafeeze Malik, *Moslem Nationalism*, 1963, pp. 13-4; Aziz Ahmad, *loc. cit.*, p. 6.

\* Italics mine.



his retirement from the Vice-Chancellor's post.

Mr Tyabji is the grandson of the great Indian patriot, Justice Badruddin Tyabji, who was the President of the Congress so far back as 1885. That great Muslim Indian's first name has always been spelled in the manner written above. And even his grandson Tyabji, the subject of our brief notice, in his book *Chaff and Grain*, under reference here, has invariably (see pp. 81, 82, 104, 105, 106, 123, 125, 201) spelt it so. The grandson Tyabji, however, writes his own name in the Arabicized form as Badr-Ud-Din Tyabji! In this connection his observations regarding the names current in Indonesia with 90 per cent of the population Muslim (pp. 92-93) are intriguingly interesting and instructive. In his article on the Indonesian Scene, which Mr Tyabji informs us (*ibid.*, p. 101, f.n.) he published in 1954, he says (pp. 88-9): "And again—and this is especially significant to an Indian observer—most Indonesians have sonorous Sanskrit names. Many of their social customs, their artistic, cultural and spiritual manifestations bring back memories of, and even create an atmosphere reminiscent of the finest periods of early Indian Aryan civilization flowering on the banks of the Ganges. . . And yet Indonesia is a country with the largest Muslim population in the world, and Islamic renaissance is one of the dominant impulses in its national life." \* It is not clear from the context whether Mr Tyabji as an Indian is glad about the position or as a Muslim sorry about it. For his remark that "all these seeming contradictions are apt to lead one astray" cannot be definitely construed one way or the other! But he is quite positive about Islamic renaissance being "an integral part of Indonesian nationalism" to such an extent that "the latter inevitably includes the former".<sup>2</sup>

Mr Tyabji with the self-depreciatory remark about his "little" knowledge of the same, tells his readers that it was "acquired by inheritance, and some spasmodic reading in Urdu, Persian, and of translations in English from Arabic and Sanskrit at odd times" (p. 25). About his interest in religion, he asserted in his lecture delivered at the Islam University at Jagjakarta in 1954, to have been "comparatively recent". It was so recent that he could describe it as having been "stimulated after his arrival" in Indonesia, i.e., in 1954. And the cause of the arousal of his interest in Islam he stated to be that he found "the atmosphere in Indonesia congenial for the kind of religious feeling that animates me". He further observed: "I know very little of the dogma even of my own religion, Islam; let alone the other great religions of India, or of the world." \* (p. 56).

Speaking before German Academy in 1959, when Mr Tyabji was India's Ambassador to West Germany, on cooperation between countries, and desiring to instance the existence of such cooperation in the past, he posed

\* Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 92.

\* Italics mine.

the problem for his actual listeners and potential readers "how many know that perhaps the greatest Indian ruler Asoka . . . had a Greek grand-mother". He asserts that Chandragupta Maurya married the daughter of Seleukos Nikator, the successor of Alexander in Asia, and strangely remarks, "I mention this, not because of its intrinsic significance; whether Asoka had a Greek grand-mother or not matters little; but because it lights up a chapter in the history of both Greek and Indian civilizations" (p. 133).

A doubtful event, supposed fact which the writer and commentator himself, too, is not decided about—otherwise Mr Tyabji would not have used the word "perhaps" in informing his audience that Asoka had a Greek grandmother—in the history of one's country is set forth as an assertion before a foreign audience. The suggestion is plain enough and the speaker's intention is patently clear that he himself saw in Asoka's work and achievement the results of Greek heredity grafted on to Indian one.

Now Asoka's Greekness could be asserted only if the Greek lady, who, according to Tyabji, was married to Chandragupta, was the mother of Bindusara, the son of Chandragupta and the father of Asoka. Otherwise even if a daughter of Seleucus was married to Chandragupta she could only nominally or rather socially, be Asoka's grandmother but not biologically. Secondly, it argues some bias or prejudice in a speaker or a writer, who, knowing a situation to be not beyond doubt, uses it as if it were an established fact, making it possible for him to point to the lesson he desires to deduce from history. The strangest thing about all this roundabout of Mr Tyabji is that the historians themselves, who have written accounts of this early age of Indian history, have pronounced on the subject in so guarded a manner that no responsible popularizer of Indian history or culture should venture to make a statement like that of Tyabji's.

*The Cambridge Shorter History of India*<sup>3</sup> published in 1934, has the following:

It is not quite clear whether a matrimonial alliance formed part of the treaty, or whether the right of marriage between the two families [of Chandragupta and of Seleucus] was simply recognised. If the usual oriental practice was followed and if we regard Chandragupta as the victor, then it would mean that a daughter or other female relative of Seleucus was given to the Indian ruler or to one of his sons, so that Asoka may have had Greek blood in his veins.

Prof. N. A. Nilakantha Sastri, writing in 1950,<sup>4</sup> stated the position as: "A matrimonial alliance also followed, perhaps a daughter of Seleucus being married either to Chandragupta or his son Brindusara." Neither of the authors affirm, besides, that either Chandragupta or Brindusara had only

<sup>3</sup> P. 33.

<sup>4</sup> *History of India*, pt. I, p. 64.

one wife and that was the Greek female, whether a daughter or a female relative of Seleucus. To build theories of culture contact and culture development on such dubious foundation and present them to a foreign audience likely to be initially biased—witness the difference between the statements of the situation made by the British authors of the *Shorter Cambridge History* and by the Indian professor—in favour of the Greeks does not bespeak absence of bias.

In the article headed "The National Flag and the National Emblem of India", Mr Tyabji tells us how as a civilian—secretary member of a high-powered committee—he was finally author of both the emblem and the flag of India (Bharat). This is how in his words it happened: "By this slow and wearing out process of trial and failure however suddenly one day, I saw light; nothing but the existing Asokan capital should be the national crest. . . This solution appears so obvious now, that it seems incredible that it should not have struck me earlier" (p. 47). About the genesis of the national flag Mr Tyabji says: ". . . when studying the Asokan Sarnath capital it struck one that the *dharmachakra* which was originally its crowning glory . . . would be the most suitable emblem to replace the *Charkaa* on the Congress flag. . . I therefore got my wife to paint a flag in the old Congress colours, saffron, white and green, but with the Asokan *dharmachakra* in the centre. . . My wife had painted the *dharmachakra* in black . . . It was changed to navy blue [by the Committee]" (pp. 44-5).

As against his effective role in fixing the national emblem and the national flag, stands his attitude to measures taken after Partition by the Union Government, whose trusted and important servant and one of the advisers in the framing of policies Mr Tyabji then was.

In his obituary note on his brother, which is "a personal memoir" extending over 25 pages in his book of 208 pages, Mr Tyabji narrates the state of his brother's mind after the Partition in 1947. In his narration he must be presumed to reveal to his readers his own attitude in so far as he does not add any counteracting observation of his own. He says that his brother's "profession brought him in close contact with a large number of Muslims whose lives and property were being wantonly, almost barbarously, destroyed by the Draconian Evacuee Laws and Regulations" \* (p. 125).

Mr Tyabji's heroes are usually Akbar, and as any Indian rightly expects his own grandfather, Badruddin Tyabji, another national hero for all Indians. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, who kept away the Muslims from the Congress and sowed the seeds of Muslim separatism, and Sir Muhammed Iqbal who watered the sapling germinating from Sir Syed's seeds and turned it into a giant tree bearing the bitter fruit of Partition (pp. 81-3) too, are Mr Tyabji's heroes.

Mr Tyabji is not content with describing Sir Muhammed Iqbal's song

"Tarana-i-Hind" as "famous patriotic song" but goes on to add (p. 83) it is "*loved and cherished as a national song*".\* And this Mr Tyabji did, while he was Indian (Bharat's) envoy or ambassador in Indonesia in 1954, before an Indonesian audience. How even an ordinary Indian, leave aside a highly placed representative of the Government of India (Bharat), could describe after 1950 any other than Ravindranath Tagore's "Jana gāna mana etc." or Bankimchandra Chatterjee's "Vande mataram etc." as a "national song" I fail to understand!

Mr Tyabji's view of his Hindu compatriots and of the purely Hindu period of Indian history appears to me not to be all that it should be for a responsible and intelligent citizen of India!

Harping on the oft-repeated partial truth, while inaugurating Indological Conference at Essen in Germany in 1959, that there "is the almost complete lack of any written historical records in India extending back to what may be called her Classical Period", Mr Tyabji asserts as an "amazing fact" that while India and Indians are mentioned in the literature and writings of many foreigners, there is "no corresponding mention of any foreigners or of any foreign countries in Indian writings or records". He supports his assertion with the more positive allegation that "Indians were so proud and self-centred that they refused to take note of any developments outside their own country or even to recognise their existence" (p.155).

Mr Tyabji should have hauled up Al-Beruni, if he had made a statement like what Tyabji represents him as having made, before the court of rationality, and asked if the Hindus did behave that way how was it that they spoke, in their astronomy-cum-astrology, of both Yavana and Romaka theories and propositions as they did (*Al Beruni's India*, I, pp. 153, 158)? As a matter of fact Al-Beruni is not at all so sweeping in his remarks. He only accuses "the present generation" as narrow-minded (*Loc. cit.*, p. 22).

In his hurry to castigate his compatriots, the Hindus, Mr Tyabji even forgets his own affirmation about their cultural intake in the past. In another essay of his in the book (p. 26) he has opined that Islam and its rulers' close connection with Iran had opened to Indian scholars the store of the cultural heritage of Arabia and the link established with China through Buddhism "had brought the treasures of China's culture within the orbit of its more enquiring minds". As Mr Tyabji has not stated that both the opportunities of rich treasure were thrown away we must take it that he implies them to have been utilized to enrich the Indian culture!

Finally I shall refer at greater length to Tyabji's concept of culture, and particularly his plan for fostering it through what is to him the appropriate educational institution, as his ideas on this subject on the eve of his assuming the charge of the office of the Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh Muslim University are most significant for our present purpose, viz., the atmosphere

\* Italics mine.

at Aligarh Muslim University.

Mr Tyabji's book *Chaff and Grain* contains one essay, which he characterizes as an "article" and must therefore have been contributed by him to some journal. Mr Tyabji, however, has not indicated anywhere the year in which he had published it. We can infer from a reference in the body of the writing itself that it was written before India became a Sovereign Republic. For Mr Tyabji speaks of His Majesty's Government supporting an Academy of the kind he has planned therein, by making available the services of one or the other of the three scholarly students of Islam then at British Universities, Bevan, Margouliuth and Nicholson (p. 30). I cannot think it probable that Mr Tyabji could have spoken of the British Government as His Majesty's Government if he had written his article after Independence. Anyway the article must have been written before Queen Elizabeth came to the throne in 1953.

Mr Tyabji moralizes over the "ruthlessly" westernized culture of Japan giving her the position of "the foremost power in the East" without any "attempt at achieving a synthesis of the East and the West on equal terms in all the fields of human thought and endeavour" and her precipitate fall in the Second World War (p. 27). And he wants his India to "avoid making such a mistake". For India, he is sure, "will never be happy unless she achieves a synthesis of Western materialism with Eastern metaphysics". If India cannot be happy going ahead with Western materialism without "her own metaphysics", she will be "equally unhappy if she strives to jettison Western materialism, *in an attempt to drift back to Vedic times*" \* (p. 27).

Mr Tyabji's confidence in the greatness of India is astonishingly yet unrealistically great in the wake of which he further argues that India's being unhappy will "infect the /whole/ world" with discontent, and thus supports his plea for an Academy, designed according to him to prepare educated Indians capable of synthesizing Western materialism and "Indian metaphysics" by an appeal on the international plane. From India's current situation, too, Mr Tyabji seeks support for his Academy and his brand of education in that institution. He asserts that India is suffering from a "cultural malaise" which to him "seems to be steadily getting worse".

To produce Indian citizens of the right type of cultural synthesis and thus to cure India of her "cultural malaise" Mr Tyabji proposed an Indian National Academy at the Centre "with chairs for the study and teaching of Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, and English" (p. 28). Though only languages are mentioned what he had in view was both language and literature and even more. He says, "The whole aim of the Academy should be to make a comparative study of these languages as well as of the culture and the religions represented by them" (p. 29).

\* *Italics mine.*

We can understand Mr Tyabji to mean the study of Hindu religion and Hindu culture subsumed under the study of Sanskrit language. We may similarly interpret English language to include the study of English or British culture but can it properly be said to subsume the study of Christianity as a whole? I do not think we can. Roman Catholicism and its culture are more intimately the concern of India, the large majority of whose Christian citizens prefer Roman Catholicism and owe allegiance to Rome. The two languages Arabic and Persian can cover not only Islamic religion and culture as a whole but can do more as Persian, before Islam captured Persia, enshrined another religion and culture.

Later, separate Chairs "for the study and teaching of Hindi and Urdu" were to be instituted by the Centre "as soon as possible". Chairs for the study of "Provincial" [regional] languages "may be added if any Province [State] wished to sponsor them". Later in the development of the Academy, first, "separate wings" for the study of Oriental and Occidental Arts by "the comparative method", and thereafter for the study of "the Sciences in the same manner" were to be added.

The students admitted to the Academy at its initial stage were to be required to study English and two other languages, one of which was to be Sanskrit, the other being naturally either Arabic or Persian. And no one was to be permitted to "learn less than two Provincial languages". As Hindi and Urdu would be added to the languages professed at the Academy before any other "Provincial language" at the initial, or at the next to the initial stage of the Academy, a student studying at it would have to study :

1. English language and its literature, religion and civilization;
2. Sanskrit language and its literature, religion and civilization;
3. either Arabic or Persian language and its literature, religion and civilization;
4. Hindi language and I take its literature too, and
5. Urdu language and its literature.

If and when, i.e., in practical counting along with Hindi and Urdu—and we may, knowing the keenness of everyone of the Linguistic States about its own language, take it that no time would be lost by them to provide for the study of their respective language—the other "Provincial languages" would be provided for at the Academy, the above scheme of study would not change numerically but would be modified, apparently to a small but intrinsically considerable extent. For then no one would be permitted to learn "more than one language belonging to the same language-group". And the language-groups as envisaged by Mr Tyabji are :

1. Hindi and the seven languages Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Kashmiri, Marathi, Oriya and Punjabi;

2. Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil and Telugu; and
3. Urdu by itself, which according to Mr Tyabji's reckoning is a language "*derived from Arabic and Persian sources*".<sup>5</sup>

The scheme of study at the Academy in its next to initial stage, as planned by Mr Tyabji would thus be :

- A. (1) English, etc. as above; (2) Sanskrit etc. as above; (3) Arabic or Persian etc. as above; (4) Hindi; and (5) Urdu; or
- B. (1) English etc., (2) Sanskrit, etc., (3) Arabic or Persian etc.; (4) Hindi; (5) Any one of the languages Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil and Telugu; or
- C. (1) (2), (3) as above; and (4) Any one of the seven languages, Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Kashmiri, Marathi, Oriya, and Punjabi; and (5) Either Urdu or any one of the four languages, Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil and Telugu; or
- D. (1) (2), (3) as above; (4) Urdu; and (5) Any one of the eight languages, Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Kashmiri, Marathi, Oriya and Punjabi; or any one of the four languages, Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil and Telugu; or
- E. (1) (2), (3) as above; (4) Any one of the four languages, Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil and Telugu; and (5) Either any one of the eight languages, Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Kashmiri, Marathi, Oriya, and Punjabi, or Urdu.

My purpose in detailing the scheme of the National Academy and its courses of study planned by Mr Tyabji is simply to see what light, if any, it throws on Tyabji's cherished views and attitudes about the rights and duties of Muslims as citizens of India on the eve of his taking over the office of the Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh Muslim University. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to that particular aspect of this scheme and not touch upon its purely educational aspects.

It should be plain to any rational individual on scrutinizing the scheme as stated above, that Mr Tyabji takes for granted and/or asserts that the 3 languages Arabic, English and Persian, which do not find even a mention in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of India, are on a par with Sanskrit in all respects and must be patronized by the Union Government on terms of complete equality. It must be remembered in this context that Sanskrit is not only one of the languages of the Eighth Schedule but is raised to the much higher status, that of a source, feeder, or mother of the national-language-to-be in Article 351 of the Constitution. The particular Article lays down that the enrichment of Hindi, the official language, so

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 29. Italics mine.

that it becomes an adequate vehicle for the "composite culture" of India shall be effected "by drawing, wherever necessary or desirable for its vocabulary, *primarily* \* on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages." Sanskrit has had its home in India and has been the language of culture in the land for nearly 4000 years. And now it is the only continuity from the hoary past, the physical continuity of the land having been broken by the Partition. The importance attached to it can be judged from the fact that since the Congress came into power in 1937 no less than 11 committees in 10 different States were appointed to report on Sanskrit till 1956, when the Union Government appointed its Sanskrit Commission.<sup>6</sup>

By placing Arabic and Persian by the side of Sanskrit on the same pedestal and by making the study of one or the other of them compulsory Mr Tyabji creates the situation of perfect equality not only between Sanskrit and Sanskritic culture on the one hand, and Perso-Arabic culture on the other, in the composite culture of India but also establishes perfect balance between the two groups, the Hindus and the Muslims, treating them as two nationalities.

The compulsory study of English and British civilization—though apparently suggested as a modernity to be synthesized with the Oriental civilizations, typified by Sanskrit and Perso-Arabic tradition—is yet capable of being looked upon as the representative of the third important component of the Indian population, the Christians. For Mr Tyabji wants also the religion typified by English to be studied. Thus Mr Tyabji may be said not to have the view that the Hindus and the Muslims in India are the two nationalities making the composite State of India but only the three important traditions which deserve to be synthesized. But this is only an apparent aspect. By raising Urdu to a position of equality with Hindi which is the Official Language of India in her existing Constitution, Mr Tyabji has secured preponderance for the Muslims in India not only over English and its Christians in India, who form a small minority, but also over Hindi and the Hindus, a community which in size is at least six times the Muslims in India.

Urdu, the mother-tongue par excellence of the Muslims in India and also the official language of West Pakistan, is to receive equal patronage with Hindi and is to be enthroned above the remaining twelve Regional languages of the Eighth Schedule. These eleven languages may be pronounced to be unfortunate ones in spite of their getting a place in the Eighth Schedule. For first, in Mr Tyabji's National Academy they are not to be patronized by the Centre; second, the speakers of these languages—I use the word speaker to mean a person who has the particular language as his mother-tongue—for practical purposes and reasons would not be able to study their own mother-tongue at the National Academy. They

\* Italics mine.

<sup>6</sup> *Report of the Sanskrit Commission*, 1958, p. 5.



cannot do so because Hindi being the official language of the Union, practical considerations must lead them to take up that language at the Academy. Having taken up the study of Hindi they would be precluded from taking their own mother-tongue as the first language in Mr Tyabji's scheme. The speakers of Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil, Telugu would have to choose Urdu as their fifth language; and the speakers of Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Kashmiri, Marathi, Oriya and Punjabi will have to take up either one of the four languages, Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil and Telugu, or Urdu. As in both cases they would have to learn a new alphabet and as protagonists of Urdu are never wearied of telling us that the most important difference between Hindi and Urdu is the one of script, Urdu, being thus easier to study and helpful to the study of Hindi, has more than equal chance of being taken up for study at Mr Tyabji's National Academy by speakers of these seven languages, i.e., by about one-third of the whole population of the country. Speakers of Hindi, who, too, fall in the same category, will be doing the same with greater probability and frequency as the study of one of the four languages of the Kannada-and-others-group would involve for them much more additional burden as a fifth language than the study of Urdu which is reiterated to be so like Hindi.

In virtual effect, therefore, Mr Tyabji's scheme of studies in his National Academy would lead to the study and cultivation of Urdu by more than two-thirds of India, i.e., by more than five times the Urdu-speakers of Pakistan. Urdu which in law today is not even a co-official language of more than one State, i.e., of people who number about half the Urdu-speakers of Pakistan, and is one of the two Official languages of Pakistan, will be cultivated in India by such a large number that in practical effect it would be one of the two Official languages of India! Muslims in India would thus stand out not as a minority, hopelessly small though in numbers, but as a community, an ethnic group affiliated to citizens of Pakistan, a large nationality as big as and perhaps bigger than the majority community of India! The plan for synthesis within India of Mr Tyabji's framing has all the potentialities of leading to a claim and a clamour for recognition of Muslims in India as a distinct nationality!

With such notions of synthesis, such undercurrents of Muslim aggrandisement, and such rather defective and even distorted view of Indian culture Mr Tyabji took charge of the office of the Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh Muslim University, where as we have seen earlier, to say the least, atmosphere, both in the teacher and the student worlds, was exacerbated and distinctly communal.

The editor of the paper penned an editorial (*Times of India*, 13-10-'62) to give wide publicity to Mr Tyabji's pronouncement on his assumption of the office of Vice-Chancellor.

The editor, complimented the University on what he considered to be evidence of good conduct in the words: "Aligarh University has not been

in the headlines for some time which all its well-wishers must find very comforting". He substantiated his compliments by pointing out that "when-ever it has been in the news the reason has been serious trouble of a communal nature". To have the correct perspective the readers must be reminded that perhaps the worst of such communal-virus-manifestation was just one year old and its ramifications had subsided not even 6 months before, the learned editor wrote down the above complimentary sigh!

The editor approvingly set forth Vice-Chancellor Tyabji's declaration that "his first interest would be the students, who, he said, must imbibe a sense of belonging to India".

Within a week of this commendation of the editor of *The Times of India*, its news-serviceman from Aligarh reported (*Times of India*, 18-10-'62) that Vice-Chancellor Tyabji speaking on the Founder's Day celebrations of the University asserted that now that many centres for the study of Islamic thought and culture and civilization were being started "Aligarh University should be made the finest and most Catholic of them all". He further opined that the University should develop "fraternal and intellectual ties" with all educational centres and particularly with such as Banaras Hindu University and Vishwabharati at Shantiniketan.

The commendation of the *Times of India* under Vice-Chancellor Tyabji's regime seems to have proved effective. For Aligarh University appeared in the news about 8 months after it and that, too, through the apparently beneficent activity of its new Vice-Chancellor. *The Times of India* news service reported from Aligarh on June 6, 1963, (*Times of India*, 7-6-'63) that Mr Tyabji had appealed to Muslims in India that they should write letters to their friends, "associates" and relatives in Pakistan urging on them the need for "an amicable settlement of Kashmir dispute". The reporter further stated that Mr Tyabji was of the opinion that "Kashmir now under Pakistani occupation may go to that country with minor adjustments along the cease-fire line".

Within 3 weeks after this apparently beneficent activity, the Aligarh University Vice-Chancellor figured in the news from New Delhi of 21 June. At a press conference Mr Badruddin Tyabji had reverted to some of his ideas expressed in *Chaff and Grain* and had even travelled beyond them. In his book he had forgotten to accommodate Buddhist "contribution" to Indian culture in his National Academy. Now he suggested a whole university to be established at the old Buddhist centre of Nalanda for studying that.

On 10 September 1963, several questions were asked with regard to the movements of Josh Malihabadi, an Urdu poet, between Pakistan and India, in the Rajya Sabha, (*Times of India*, 11-9-'63) by a Muslim member, Mr A. M. Tariq. On the same day in the reply by Professor Humayun Kabir, Minister for Education, to Mr Deokinandan Narayan it came out, though laconically, that Aligarh University had, apparently very recently permitted the

use of Roman Script, evidently for Hindi, to those students whose mother-tongue was neither Hindi nor Urdu!

Newly incorporated Goa, naturally in more sense than one, provided Mr Tyabji a splendid opportunity for concretising his Christian side of the National Academy. He straightway proceeded to suggest that a University for studying [and fostering?] the "Christian contribution" to Indian culture should be established at Goa. He asked the Banaras Hindu University to become a centre for the study of "*Sanskritic influences on Indian Thought*." \* His own Aligarh University, Mr Tyabji described as "a great centre of Indian learning" and as "one of our great assets". And he wanted it to *specialize in the study of Islamic contribution to Indian culture*. \* With such views on specialization, which I have no doubt an intelligent reader of this book, or of Mr Badr-ud-din Tyabji's *Chaff and Grain*, would find to be not in consonance with his professed panacea for his supposed "cultural malaise" of India, Mr Tyabji could be expected to agree to the dropping of the qualifying word appearing after the word Aligarh in the name of his University. But he actually told the pressmen that he was not in favour of dropping it.

Evidently he parried all inconvenient further questioning by stating the objective, which he had stressed on his assumption of the office of Vice-Chancellor in the words "The students' sense of belonging to India", in the charmingly grand ones as: "The more fundamental task was to reshape the content of teaching and the outlook of students." He further stated that his University had "already initiated a scheme for the reshaping of the general education course to make the student aware of the total heritage of India and not of a part of it".

Mr Tyabji pointed out to the pressmen evidently as a proof of the wholeness presented by the University to its students that "more than a quarter of the students in the university were non-Muslims". I should request the reader to remember that when the Enquiry Committee reported at the beginning of 1961 the number of non-Muslim students was stated to be about one-third of the total!

Vice-Chancellor Tyabji's zeal, one which is intriguingly common to almost all leading Muslim Indians as will be clear in the course of this study, for Roman script, led him to introduce "as an associate script" the Roman Script "for learning Urdu and Hindi", as he revealed to the pressmen "particularly for students from non-Urdu speaking [?/] areas".

On 11 June 1963 *The Times of India* published the news that at the 21st Annual conference of the All-India Jamiat-ul-ulema on the previous day, the Jamiat adopted at Meerut a resolution "opposing the alleged eviction of Muslims from Assam", arguing that "it was unjust to evict Muslims without giving them an opportunity to prove their bonafides". *The Times*

\* Italics mine.

of *India* in its issue of 13 June commented through its Current Topics column on the resolution asking what grounds for any complaint about eviction of Pakistani Muslim the Jamiat had. The comment revealed that the "number of illegal immigrants" was "over three lakhs (3,00,000) and that only a small fraction of those who came in" were "sent back". It further affirmed that the Pakistani infiltrators had received help from "certain elements" making the "Government's belated efforts to trace and evict them" not as successful as they should or would have been.

How could any University satisfy its conscience that it has done well by the Constitution of India by permitting its students to do Hindi in Roman script when the Constitution in Article 343 quite definitely lays down that the Official Language of the Union shall be Hindi written in Devanagari script I am unable to understand. And when the Minister for Education of the Union Government sort of blesses such a step on the specious plea of autonomy of a University one can clearly see that he is not serving the cause of national solidarity even as an ordinary citizen is expected to do, much less as one entrusted with the effective implementation of educational machinery in the cause of such solidarity!

Mr Arif G. Kadvani in his letter to the Editor of 25 October, published in *The Times of India* after a whole week, on 4 November 1963, drew the attention of the authorities that Pakistani Urdu journals espousing the cause of Pakistan and containing inflammatory matter, one of which carried on its front page a multi-colour photograph of Liaquat Ali Khan were being sold. He commented upon the free sale [?] of such journals as "an attempt to tamper with the loyalty of Indians".

The same paper in its issue of 9 November carried a brief resume by its staff reporter of Dr Zakir Husain's speech at a dinner meeting of the Indo-Arab Society in Bombay. Dr Husain, then the Vice-President of India, maintained that "the 45 million Indian Muslims were co-rulers with their countrymen of other faiths in the secular democracy". He further told them that "*This new situation* \* would make them contribute significantly to a cultural synthesis of great value". The correct perspective for Dr Husain's reported use of the expression "this new situation" is provided in the next sentence of the reporter which reads: "The Vice-President said that, *in history Muslims had either ruled exclusively or had been ruled by non-Muslims*".\*\*

Dr Husain liked to familiarize what he, like Smith, chose to describe as the new role or the new situation of the Muslims in India. For addressing

\* Italics mine.

\*\* Italics mine. I must draw the readers' attention to the fact that Wilfred Cantwell Smith, the well-known Canadian student of the Muslims of British India, in his bid to be an equally distinguished authority on Muslims as a whole, and writing in 1957 his *Islam in Modern History*, at p. 286 observes: "Muslims have either had political power or they have not. *Never before have they shared it with others.*"

the Coimbatore District Muslim Citizens Committee about a week or so later he pointed out that "in the India of today the Muslims shared power unlike in the past when they were either rulers or were ruled" while asking his co-religionists to "shed all complexes" (*Times of India*, 22-11-63, "Current Topics").

The statements and assertion of both Smith and Dr Zakir Husain appear to me to be ill-advised. Surely in the U.S.S.R., the Muslim majority Republics, to take only one instance, are an example of co-rule with non-Muslims older than the Indian one!

The year 1964 brought in more violent allegations, more intransigence and very much more bitter communal riots as a reaction to the harassment of the Hindus in East Pakistan. The year 1963 ended with riots started by Kashmir's Muslims in Srinagar and the year 1964 started with East Pakistani Muslims looting, burning and killing Hindus in their State as a repercussion of the Srinagar incidents. So we find Hatim Jaliwala of Bombay writing to the Editor of *The Times of India* on the first day of 1964 deeply regretting "the most un-Islamic" behaviour of Srinagar Muslims (*Times of India*, 4-1-64) and 17 West Bengal Muslims condemning "the brutal atrocities on Hindu minorities in East Pakistan" in the last week of the first month of the year (*Times of India*, 24-1-64).

February of the year brought the incredible revelation from Delhi that the authorities had entrusted many important documents written in Persian about the great monument Taj Mahal to a tourist-guide and the rather irritating news that the guide had made away to Pakistan with all of them (*Times of India*, 7-2-64, "Current Topics"). The third of the month featured Calcutta Muslims in a bad light. The news of 16 February was that 25 persons [Muslims?] were arrested in the Beniapukur area of central Calcutta when a crowd attacked the police party which had gone there to arrest two persons under the Defence of India Rules. The Police took under custody one Mr Mohammed Salauddin (Jr.), a municipal councillor of Calcutta, and found themselves surrounded and attacked by a crowd but managed to go off with their quarry. Later, a strong police force arriving on the spot arrested 25 persons concerned in the fray and took under custody another Muslim leader, Mr Mohammed Salauddin (Sr ?) who was the chief administrative officer of Anjuman-Mufidul-Islam, under the same Rules (*Times of India*, 17-2-64).

Riotous occurrences in West Bengal, Bihar and Orissa arising out of the forceful expulsion of large classes of Hindus and Christians from East Pakistan, which took place in January, had further repercussions which got vented in the Rajya Sabha in the first week of March. Mr G. L. Nanda, the then Union Home Minister, told the House on 5 March that some Muslims had been engaged in creating panic among their co-religionists in Calcutta, instigating them to demand migration to East Pakistan. He also stated that the same elements were responsible for the mass resignations

by Muslim employees of the Calcutta Port authorities in their attempt at creating a situation similar to what existed in January (*Times of India*, 6-3-'64).

The very next day Mr R. M. Hajarnavis, Minister of State for Home Affairs, made a statement in the Loka Sabha intimating that the arrest of Mr Muzzaffar Hussain, a member of the House, made by U.P. Government was in respect of a highly objectionable speech he had made at Tanda in Faizabad District on 2 July 1963. In his speech Mr Hussain had told his audience that "Muslim women were given injections for effecting birth control" and that "that would make them sterile without their knowledge so that the number of Muslims might be reduced". He further "complained that the Government proposed to make changes in Muslim personal law to convert Muslims to Hinduism". He exhorted his audience "to rise and accept the challenge". The U.P. Police had registered a case against Mr Hussain on 25 January and on a warrant he was arrested on 15 February in his village (*Times of India*, 7-3-'64).

A late news item in *The Times of India* issue of 26 March, announced the recovery by Calcutta police of a "large quantity of chemicals and other materials for the manufacture of bombs" in a night raid on the house of a Muslim in East Calcutta.

All fool's day revealed *the use of Pakistani text books in certain private schools in the border towns and villages of Rajasthan, containing anti-Indian and pro-Pakistani propaganda, especially in maktabas where Maulavis conducted the instruction*\* (*Times of India*, 1-4-'64). The next day's issue of *The Times of India* contained the news that a Muslim worker in a tyre factory at Sewri, Bombay, had made derogatory remarks about the national flag and used a paper replica of it for cleaning a machine on the Republic Day (26 January) and that he was arrested by the Special Branch, Bombay C.I.D. after an enquiry.

On Friday, 3 April 1964, Muslims of Bombay in a meeting convened by the representatives of 36 Muslim organizations and presided over by Mr Abid Ali, the Congress Secretary, passed a number of resolutions among which figured one condemning Pakistani "atrocities" perpetrated on the minorities of East Pakistan. They declared further that Kashmir was an "indivisible and integral part" of India and that "*the people of Kashmir have themselves proclaimed this fact unambiguously through their freely elected Constituent Assembly and reiterated it in two successive elections*". They asserted that "*the demand [of Pakistan] for a plebiscite in Kashmir was without any justification in view of this unambiguous verdict of the people of Kashmir*". They maintained that the resolutions of the Security Council passed in 1948-49 had become obsolete "*as Pakistan had failed to fulfil its obligations laid down in those resolutions*". They even declared

\* Italics mine.

categorically that *Pakistan was illegally occupying a part of Kashmir consequent upon its wanton aggression\** (*Times of India*, 4-4-'64).

Once again the Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh Muslim University Mr Badruddin Tyabji figured, but in a not too favourable situation, in the news on 14 April 1964. While air-wafting advice to the Kashmiri "lion", Shaikh Abdulla, on his release, as to how he should behave, he described the warnings uttered by Mr Shastri and Mr Chagla as "fortunate but necessary"! (*Times of India*, 14-4-'64).

Mr N. M. Anwar, a member of the Rajya Sabha, in his speech on the Finance Bill styling Sheikh Abdulla as Sher-i-Kashmir (Lion of Kashmir) described his future in glowing terms as not only the harbinger but also as the actual architect of Hindu-Muslim unity. Under pressure of a question by one of the members of the House he said: "Under the present system of joint electorate, the Hindu society has no opportunity to get to know the real mind of the Muslim community because most Muslims they have adopted in the secular State have naturally got to be considered as the show boys of the majority community." Without scanning the special and perhaps specious reasoning of this elected legislator, I should remind the reader of my submission made that one of the objectives of Muslims in India, as they were frustrated by the actual Partition of the country in 1947, is to press for separate electorates (*The Times of India*, 27-4-'64).

In May in the State of Bihar was formed, under the presidency of Mr A. Q. Ansari, the Health Minister of the State, the Bihar Congress Muslim Front. On 7 May, it passed a number of resolutions. One of them reiterated the view that "five crores [in actual fact the Census of 1961 makes them out to be less than 47 millions] of Muslims in India" would not tolerate the separation of Kashmir from India, a view and plea voiced also on the same day by the Jamiat-ul-ulema and other Muslim organizations of Cuttack and Sambalpur in Orissa, and of the Dawoodi Bohras of Godhra in Gujarat. Another resolution of the Bihar Congress Muslim Front condemned the communal riots in East Pakistan and the atrocities committed there on the Hindus and Christians (*Times of India*, 8-5-'64).

As to the almost unanimous view of Muslims in India that Kashmir was a part of India and that Pakistan's claim and attempt to reopen the question was absolutely baseless, it has to be pointed out that though Sheikh Abdulla was condemned by prominent Muslims elsewhere for his views on Kashmir and Pakistan's right to open the question was denied and though he reiterated his opinion in Bombay to the Jamiat-ul-ulema, Sheikh Abdullah was accorded tumultuous ovation and thunderous applause by Bombay Muslims, when he boarded the steamer ostensibly to go on pilgrimage, which subsequent events proved to be an unabashed campaign of vilification of India and furtherance of the Pakistani claim on Kashmir.

Soon after this the All India Congress Committee met in Bombay and a report of its proceedings in the issue of *The Times of India* for 17 May contained the information, much of it in bold and thick type, that Dr Zakaria, a Minister in the Government of Maharashtra, read an Urdu poem composed by him containing eulogy of Indian secularism and passionate call for the Valley of Kashmir as part of India. Bharataratna Lal Bahadur Shastri who was then Minister without portfolio in the Union Government, was reported to have taken away the piece and Mr Sadiq to have said to him "You have our case in a nutshell".

On 22 May 1964, *The Times of India* with rather rare alacrity and very special courtesy published almost a column-long-letter written to the editor by Mr A. A. A. Fyzee on 18 May, contents of which in the context of Sheikh Abdullah's views, Muslim resolutions and affirmations, of the politico-historical events of the previous 17 years and of Mr Fyzee's antecedents, not to mention the later developments, assumes great significance.

Mr Fyzee begins his letter by rating the editor of *The Times of India* for "the lack of understanding" he displayed in his "columns on the Kashmir question" and states that he writes on the question, evidently to enlighten the editor and also to disburden the readers of *The Times of India* of their notions on the "Kashmir question" in the capacity of "a student of the Moslem world and an Indian". He craves for the hospitality of the columns of the journal "to present the other side of the picture". And the other side of the picture, as the reader will find, turns out to be the Pakistani view of Kashmir, pure and simple, dressed in some kind of plausible appearance!

The solution of "the problem" must be based on three conditions: (1) "the good of the people of Kashmir"; (2) the good is to be "determined by the people of Kashmir, *the whole of it*"\*; and (3) "the accord of India and Pakistan". In dilating on the first condition Mr Fyzee roundly and uncereemoniously sets aside the Indian view, asserted in authoritative pronouncements by India's highest legal luminaries and her front-rank political leaders, that Kashmir is a part of India and its accession to India is complete and final, by dubbing all such pronouncements as "slogans". And to reduce this authoritative view of the Government and the Parliament of the country, whose citizen he asserts himself to be,—it is necessary to mention that to the best of my knowledge Mr Fyzee has not delivered himself publicly of any such revelation either for the guidance or for criticism of the resolutions and decisions any time before when they were actually declared—to absurdity, he poses a number of questions regarding Kashmir's special position which had continued to be what it was at its accession.

Mr Fyzee knew that the Government of India was already thinking of

\* Italics mine.



repealing the Article of the Constitution, Article 370, regarding the special status of Kashmir. So he forearms himself, having been forewarned, by asserting that the repeal cannot be effected without "the recommendation of the Constituent Assembly of the State", emphasizing that it is the Constituent Assembly and not the Legislature that is competent in the matter. As a finale for his presentation of the case against his country's and Government's considered decision and on the background and in spite of Shaikh Abdullah's volte-face on the question and of the Muslim community's resolutions on the situation, some of which are noted above, he makes an *obiter dictum*, of course as a "student of the Moslem world", which is untruth in scientific language. And that is: ". . . anyone who has knowledge of men and matters knows that the *Moslems* are as a rule an *emotional race*,"\* and an imaginative gesture of give and take in arranging a delicate matter will assuredly have good results."

That the "Moslems" are "an emotional race" is a proposition which is in scientific language an untruth and an unproved proposition. It is untruth because to the extent that race is a scientific concept even the Moslems of India, let alone those of the world, are not one race: they are at least three or four "races". The Moslems of the world belong to all the known and accepted races of man, except the Nordic. Nobody has studied them to be able to assert that such a motley group has only one type of mentality. And history shows clearly that some of them can be as level-headed, as hard-hearted, as any human group is known to have been!

Further it was, "tolerably clear" to Mr Fyzee "that Kashmir cannot remain divided as at present". He therefore asserted that "the 'status quo' theory is dead and buried past redemption".\*

Mr Fyzee, who is so generous to his co-religionists in the whole world as to lump them together as one group and characterize it as marked with emotion and nobility, has no scruples to castigate a whole community of his co-citizens, the Marwadi, as Machiavellian "who incidentally justifies the use of force for legal title" \*\* !

Almost exactly a month after Mr Fyzee's doublebarrelled performance through the columns of *The Times of India*, the issue of that paper for 18 June flashed the news that in Calcutta an Indian Muslim was discovered "doing a flourishing business in helping Pakistanis to enter India without valid passports and to send Indians to Pakistan through illegal methods on payment of fat fees".

The second week of July brought Aurangabad into the limelight with its

\* Italics mine.

\*\* Within about fifteen months of Mr Fyzee's commendation of the world Muslims and of Pakistan, his vigorous sponsoring of the latter's claim, and his almost savage condemnation of the leaders of his own country, the events of July onwards of 1965 gave a direct lie to his commendatory and sponsoring activity and a sharp snub to his condemnatory ego!

explosions the mystery of which, after a whole week of news-serviceman's toil, was not fully cleared up. It was revealed in a press conference that "the cause of the explosions was the large-scale manufacture and storage of fireworks, containing prohibited compositions of a sensitive and dangerous nature". The nature of the "composition" can be gauged from the fact that about "one hundred persons were rendered homeless", 12 huts were destroyed, 13 persons were killed, and at least 50 others injured, "the doors and windows of several houses were shattered", and "an electric post near the hut where the explosion occurred was twisted out of shape". The police who claimed "to have arrived at certain conclusions which throw light on the causes of the explosions" were "reluctant to disclose any details". They, however, carried out raids for search at Bhir, 80 miles from Aurangabad, and seized "a large quantity of gunpowder from the house of one Mohammed Abdul Hamid, who was allegedly holding the material without license" (*Times of India*, 9, 11, 12 and 16-7-64).

The communal reprisals of the early months of the year 1964, which had raised ire and generated poison in the hearts of Muslims in India, had evidently worked as a leaven with the so-called nationalist Muslims. And Dr Syed Mahmud, MP, who had presided over the Muslim Convention of 1961 at Delhi, came forward with his activity, preparing the ground for another such fault-finding, complaint-raising and demand-making convention. In his letter of 24 July addressed to the editor of *The Times of India* from New Delhi (*Times of India*, 27-7-64) he began with a sharp rebuke to those Indians who, pained by the forcible eviction of Hindus or Christians from East Pakistan, had suggested that the Government of India should, under the prevailing circumstances, demand an exchange of populations and ended thus: "Even a discussion of such a proposition" which 'insinuates that Muslims are not worthy citizens of this country'-- mark the twist of the simple proposition of exchange number for number, without any suggestion regarding the worthiness of any population to be the citizens of the country where they were but only with the fact of forcible ejection of Hindus and Christians out of East Pakistan though entitled to live there "is humiliating to all honest Muslims who wish to live and prosper in their own country".

Next, making a plea that the misunderstanding and suspicion indicated by such a proposal should be removed by the Muslims themselves, he revealed that "some prominent Muslim organisations in India", after detailed discussions "had asked him to convene a small consultative meeting in Lucknow", the purpose being "to help Muslims in realising their responsibility".

Further recommending the procedure, he observed:

Muslims should realise that they have been isolating themselves from the mainstream of the country's political and social life. *They should*

*organise forums which will promote an atmosphere of understanding and mutual trust. The proposed Lucknow consultative meeting to be held on August 8 and 9 is an attempt to focus the attention of Muslims towards this need.\**

A short report<sup>o</sup> of the proceedings of the All-India Muslim Consultative Convention held on 8 August appeared in *The Times of India* the next day. Dr Syed Mahmud appealed to the gathering "to concentrate its attention on thinking out a remedy for 'the manifold injustices and prejudices'\* to which the community may be [?] subjected on cultural, political and economic planes". He drew the attention of the audience to six points:

1. Muslims must dismiss the idea that they are unwanted and should persuade others to come closer to them;
2. Muslims must be united and that it is the convention which must explore all possibilities of unity and integration;
3. Ways and means must be devised by the convention to eliminate the possibility of communal disturbances of the kind that had occurred a few months earlier resulting in making some Muslims intent on leaving India, their homeland;
4. Muslims must not isolate themselves from the social and political currents of the country, a state of affairs which must be counteracted;
5. *Muslims were exposed to a number of threats on religious and cultural levels\*;*
6. Muslims had been lagging behind in the fields of education and commerce.

Dr Mahmud told his hearers that "*they were meeting at a time when the Muslim minority was passing through a very critical period of history*". Next day the Convention resolved that a 21-man committee with Dr Mahmud its chairman, should be appointed to devise ways and means to tackle the problems, and authorized Dr Mahmud to announce the names of the members of the Committee, to be called Majlis-e-Musha-Warat, in consultation with the presidents of the Jamiat-ul-ulama, the Muslim League, the Jamaat-i-Islami [the extremist organization banned even in Pakistan] and the general secretary of the Majiat-ul-Ulama (*Times of India*, 11-8-'64).

There was, however, a rift in the lute of the Convention on the second day of its meeting, exposing its tune. Five West Bengal Muslim legislators who were attending the Convention staged a walk-out on that day as they were not permitted to put their viewpoint before the meeting. In their

\* Italics mine.

statement they said: "We regret to find the whole show is restricted to a selected few, belonging to certain Muslim organisations. Even Muslim legislators of U.P. were not invited" (*Times of India*, 10-8-'64).

*The Times of India* issue of 1 November 1964, reported that Dr Syed Mahmud as president of the All-India Muslim Consultative Council [in the earlier despatches the group figures as committee] addressing a press conference in Bombay explained that the council which had received a "tremendous" response from people of all communities was primarily concerned in creating a "climate of goodwill". Thus it is seen that according to Dr Mahmud the group which was specifically formed to solve or rather tackle 6 questions regarding his co-religionists in India had confined itself to only one of them and that, too, the most "national" of all!

The letter of Mr V. S. Ahmed Basha of Bombay dated 12 November, published in *The Times of India* on 23 November, raising a fundamental question has passed without much comment or discussion, and deserves to be noted here as the question, only a few months later, guided the whole campaign of vilification of Mr M. C. Chagla, the then Education Minister *vis-a-vis* his courageous and very rational action in the imbroglio prevailing at Aligarh Muslim University.

Mr Chagla and the Central Advisory Board on his advice had called for legislation to bar "unrecognised" educational institutions from conducting examinations or granting diplomas. The correspondent contended that such a step would contravene "the fundamental rights given to minorities under Article 30 (1) of the Constitution".

The last two days of November 1964 ushered in the almost unique sight of the so-called National Democratic Convention organized by the Jamiat-ul-ulema which was attended by 400 Muslim delegates from different parts of the country, leading Congressmen, and Members of Parliament. It was addressed by the Union Home Minister. Dr B. Ramakrishna Rao, a former Governor of U.P., read out his presidential address in chaste Urdu. Mr Morarji Desai, for some years Chief Minister of Bombay State and then Finance Minister of the Union Government for some time and later Deputy Prime Minister, was very properly prompted to ask in clearest terms whether the Convention was a Muslim meeting. But his next question "Is Urdu the language of Muslims only?" was not quite consistent. He averred that the Muslim League had been propagating that Urdu was the language of the Muslims and that both in Gujarat and Madras Urdu was taught to the Muslims consequent upon the League's propaganda. He is said to have appealed to the Muslims not to isolate themselves from the mainstream of Indian life. Mr Fakhruddin Ahmed, the Finance Minister of Assam and later Union Cabinet member, who, as readers must be remembering, was one of the very few Muslims who strongly disfavoured the holding of the Muslim Convention of 1961, said: "I am not ashamed to be a Muslim. One of the tenets of my faith is that I should be loyal

to my country" (*Times of India*, 30-11-'64).

The news-serviceman's despatch published in *The Times of India* issue of 7 December 1964 revealed that the Union Home Ministry was much perturbed over the two Muslim conferences mentioned above.

These conferences had prompted the editor of *The Times of India* to pen a leading article on 3 December 1964, entitled "Indian Muslims". The learned editor completely missed the difference between the Muslim Democratic Convention of August in Lucknow and its successor the National Democratic Convention of November in New Delhi; and felt happy over the absence of recriminating technics at the latter. It would have been the height of folly if such would have been, even if it could have been, indulged in at the latter which was presided over by an Andhra Hindu Congressman who was an ex-Governor of U.P., and was addressed by the Union Home Minister and by Mr Morarji Desai, and at which prominent members of Parliament were present. Yet even he had to end his congratulatory performance with the following exhortation which is eloquent in its implications about the Muslim sayings and doings:

A great deal of progress has been made in promoting the ideas of secularism. In fact even communal organisations find it necessary in the interest of political respectability to claim to be non-communal. In any case there is no dearth of secular organisations through which the Muslims can play their legitimate role in national life. Participation in active politics will help to end their sense of isolation and frustration. *Some of the barriers that divide the Muslims from the rest of the nation are of their own making and it is up to them to break these barriers.\**

One month after the salutary advice and admonition administered by the editor of *The Times of India*, the news appeared in its issue of 5 January 1965, that Mr Mohammed Ismail, President of the All-India Muslim League, presiding over the North Arcot Muslim League conference, declared that his organization was not communal but was a political party which believed in democratic principles. At the same time he appealed to Muslims [only Muslims mark well!] to forge unity among themselves and to fight nonviolently for their constitutional rights!

Before the end of January came a very authoritative pronouncement on Indian secularism by Mr M. C. Chagla, Minister of Education in the Union Government. Mr Chagla, who had worked as Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah's junior in his chamber at the High Court of Bombay more than 40 years ago and had parted company with him when Jinnah became a Muslim-Leaguer, was for a number of years the Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court, Vice-Chancellor of Bombay University, India's ambassador at

\* Italics mine.

Washington and later at London for some time, delivered, on 16 January the Convocation address to Osmania University at Hyderabad, an extract from which was published under Mr Chagla's name in *The Times of India* on 20 January 1965.

Pointing out that originally Osmania University was started [by the then Nizam of Hyderabad] in order "to give an impetus to Urdu and Persian and Arabic culture" he said that "today" it figured as "the best illustration of how *our multi-cultural society* can be helped by an institution of higher studies of the character of Osmania University". The Osmania University, he told his audience, represented "*really three cultures; the Urdu culture which was the result of Muslims coming into the country, the old Indian culture represented by the Telugu language and the Western culture ... due to our long contact with the United Kingdom and recently with the United States*".\* The University he went on was also "a very fine example of one of the finest concepts that we have embodied in our Constitution, the concept of secularism", which he submitted was India's "greatest contribution in recent times to political science and world thought". This secularism, according to him "*is more than a mere constitutional device or a method of establishing good relations between different communities living in a country*".\* He affirmed that it is based on a philosophy and a scheme of values typified by tolerance running through India's whole historical record with minor exceptions.

Mr Chagla further said: "*I frankly do not understand when people talk of minority rights and privileges. This expression makes no sense in the context of our Constitution.*"\*

Briefly mentioning the "two nations"-theory of the Muslim League and its supporters as the cause of the partition of India into Pakistan and India (Bharat), Mr Chagla stated that India (Bharat) had not accepted that theory and said:

*Therefore, the Muslims who refused to migrate to Pakistan and chose to live in the country of their forefathers most emphatically reject this doctrine [of the two-nations theory] and must give their complete and unequivocal loyalty to the land of their birth. I have found very often a feeling of fear and anxiety among some of the Muslims whom I have met. This, to my mind, is wholly unjustified. It is time they shook off this inferiority complex and realised that India is as much their country as of their Hindu fellow countrymen. They should be as proud of this country, its great past and its present achievements, as any other citizen. But it is essential that they should not exhibit any separatist tendencies or form themselves into separate communal organisations . . . They should remember with pride that they have made a great contri-*

\* Italics mine.

*bution to Indian culture. But it is not only this culture which they should cherish; what belongs to them is the whole of the Indian culture and their legacy does not commence from the Muslim invasion, but from the time when the Aryans crossed our frontiers and opened a new chapter in the history of the world.\**

*Vis-a-vis* Pakistan's demands about Kashmir Mr Chagla said:

Whatever else is negotiable, Kashmir certainly is not. If it is an integral part of our country, as it undoubtedly is, then no government can barter away a part of its country in order to buy peace or friendship.

Referring to the comparative lack of great historians in India and explaining the fact as being due to "*our philosophy*, which believes in timelessness, which is concerned more with eternity, and which looks upon this world as *maya*", he said:

History must, therefore, be taught not merely to record the wars and battles of our history, the communal and caste differences or the subjugation of our country by foreign invaders, but our history should register how from times immemorial people of different religions have lived together in tolerance and friendship, how India has absorbed the culture of its invaders and made it part of its own.

The fourth week of February (*Times of India*, 24-2-65) gave proof of the vitality of the League in Bombay. The working committee of the Maharashtra State Muslim League at its meeting in Bombay expressing its deep sympathy for those killed and for those who suffered in the language disturbances in the country endorsed the following opinions and views:

1. The "Government's unthoughtful and hasty language policy" was the cause of the above-mentioned disturbances.
2. A review of the question of Urdu must be made.
3. The State of Maharashtra Government should reinstate the two Muslim holidays, Id-ul-Duha (Bakr-Id) and Id-e-Milad, which it had recently dropped from its list of "bank holidays".
4. The Bombay Municipal Corporation's decision to keep the slaughter houses closed on the following Hindu and Jain holidays, Janmastami (Lord Krishna's birthday), Samvatsari (Jain), Mahavir Jayanti (Mahavir's birthday), Buddha Jayanti (Lord Buddha's birthday), Rama Navami (Lord Rama's birthday) and Shivaji Jayanti (the

\* Italics mine.

birthday of Shivaji, the nationalist founder of the Maratha resistance in the second half of the 17th century) should be revoked.

It should be remembered while appraising the true nature of this demand of Bombay Muslims that it was not very long ago that the Government of Maharashtra, desiring to curtail the number of statutory holidays, of which there has been a very long list in India, the longest of all the lists of the great nations of the world, had abolished the abovenoted two Muslim holidays along with such very important holidays of the Hindus as "Ramanavami", Rama's Ninth (birthday anniversary), and the Coconut Day.

The last week of April brought in a unique spectacle of barbarous behaviour of some students and high officers of Aligarh Muslim University exposing their naked communalism. On 25 April while the University Court was in session some 1,500 students of the University [Muslim students?] demonstrating against the decision of the University Academic Council passed on 12 April, reserving for students from outside Aligarh University 50 per cent of the admissions in the technological and other courses, stormed the meeting and, in the presence of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor and other dignitaries of the University, severely manhandled the Vice-Chancellor Mr Ali Yavar Jung, inflicting on him more than two dozen injuries for which he had to be operated upon at a private nursing home on 28 April (*Times of India*, 27, 28, 29-4-'65; 4, 5, 7 and 20-5-'65).

As the editor of *The Times of India* in his editorial entitled "Aligarh" (*Times of India*, 20-5-'65) pointed Mr Ali Yavar Jung's appointment as Vice-Chancellor, immediately after the period of Mr B. F. H. Tyabji was over, was "resented by the obscurantist Muslim elements in the teaching staff and the administration of the university". Mr Chagla (*Times of India*, 4-5-'65) revealed that the dissatisfied reactionary and communal elements in the University, knowing Mr Ali Yavar Jung's liberal and non-sectarian outlook, had begun active propaganda against him since 1 October 1964 soon after his appointment, "often making libellous statements against him". He further stated that though the agitation was apparently against the change in the reservation of admissions to the technology and engineering courses in the University, in reality it was a *planned campaign* "directed against", the Vice-Chancellor "personally because of his broad and nationalistic approach to the problems of the University\*" (*Times of India*, 4-5-'65).

The nature of the injuries received by the Vice-Chancellor is best gauged by the fact that the issue of *The Times of India* of 7 May contained the news that Mr Ali Yavar Jung was convalescing in a New Delhi nursing-home and that 12 prominent Muslim members of Parliament and educationists had, in a written appeal, requested him not to resign from his post.

\* Italics mine.



Speaking in the Rajya Sabha on 4 May (*Times of India*, 5-5-'65), Mr Chagla told the house that the Government was considering a proposal to suspend the constitution of Aligarh University and to promulgate an ordinance for its management. He also revealed that actually there was a conspiracy or reactionary Muslims against Mr Ali Yavar Jung, and that the conspirators had included in the students action-committee two Hindus, one of whom was "a notorious character from Jammu and another from U.P." The conspirators were to have murdered the Vice-Chancellor during the disturbances of 25 April, and had kept a coffin ready at hand; but their attempt was foiled by the timely protection given to him by two students and the assistant registrar at great risk to themselves. The editor of *The Times of India* upholding the Government ordinance and the Education Minister's explanation in his leading article "Aligarh University" in the issue of the paper for 7 June picked out for mention Mr Chagla's statement that "*the most disgraceful part in the incidents was played by some members of the staff with the backing of a section of the university court*".\*

Such in brief have been the sayings and doings, apart from the doings that come under clashes or riots and sayings that may be shrouded in text-books or other books of some Muslim Indians during the last 15 years and more. Their main burden can be discerned to be that of activating the Muslim community to the position of a pressure group so as to secure political and other special rights calculated to nurture and develop group identity as a separate entity for the Muslims in India.

\* Italics mine.

## CHAPTER

### 13

## LINGUISTIC TENSIONS

On the linguistic score, it is arguable that Africa, despite the great number of its languages, has an advantage over India in that it is not generally threatened by the spread of education in the vernacular which might disrupt a still tenuous national unity. In the case of India, where the country is divided into provinces on the basis of the linguistic communities, it is by no means inconceivable that local nationalisms might arise to challenge the solidarity of the Indian nation.\*

RUPERT EMERSON

SOME YEARS BEFORE Professor Rupert Emerson expressed the above-quoted view, Professor Joshua Whatmouth,<sup>1</sup> the Harvard linguist, writing in 1956 before the States Reorganization Commission had reported, had observed:

As these lines were being written news came that a new state of Andhra has been created to accommodate speakers of the Dravidian Telugu. Wiser counsel might deplore these separatist tendencies unless and until they are offset by some genuine means of interlingual communication, not necessarily English, or any single language. Already the government of India has appointed a commission to consider the problem on a national scale before linguistic cleavage leads to the formation of more 'splinter states'.

By the time Professor Emerson expressed his views three or four so-called splinter-states had arisen, and while the earlier of the lines of this book were being written another splinter was knocked off. And one cannot deny the possibility of one or two more splinters coming off to shape themselves into States!

This fact of the so-called splintering does not imply any lack of consciousness of the need for interlingual communication. As a matter of fact the motive force for splintering is rather old, both linguistic and traditional to some extent. The Constituent Assembly in full knowledge of these mo-

\* In *Nation-Building* (p. 114) edited by Karl Deutsch and Foltz.

<sup>1</sup> *Language, a Modern Synthesis*, 1958, p. 29.

tive forces adopted certain proposals calculated to cement linguistic unity, or in the words of Professor Whatmouth, to provide interlingual communication.

The importance of the provision for interlingual communication felt by the makers of the Constitution of India can be gauged from the fact that a whole Part, Part XVII, of the Constitution is named Official Language, Chapter I of which is headed "Language of the Union", Chapter II, "Regional Languages", Chapter III, "Language of the Supreme Court, High Courts," etc. and Chapter IV "Special Directives". Article 343 lays down the official language of the Union to be Hindi in Devanagari script. It further provides for the continuance of the then language of administration, English, for 15 years from the commencement of the Constitution and empowers the Parliament to enact legislation extending the period for the use of the English language for any or all the official purposes beyond the period of 15 years laid down.

There are four Articles 350, 350A, 350B and 351 which at present comprise the chapter on Special Directives. Of these Articles 350A and 350B, providing for instruction at the primary stage through the mothertongue of the children belonging to linguistic minorities of particular States and enjoining the appointment of a Special Officer, now known as the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, to study and report annually on the problems of these minorities, State by State, were added in 1956. They may be said to have been not only inspired but also originated by the States Reorganization Commission appointed under the Chairmanship of the late Mr Fazal Ali in 1953 [1954].

Article 350 entitles members of minority languages (including dialects) "used in the Union or in the State, as the case may be" "to submit a representation for the redress of any grievances to any office or authority of the Union or a State" in their languages (or dialects). While laying down a code for the implementation of the various safeguards for linguistic minorities, the Chief Minister's Conference of 1961 provided, in their scheme for this particular Article, by requiring that for all such representations "arrangements should be made for replies to be sent, wherever possible [I take it that the saving clause applies to the content of the representation and not to the language of the reply to be sent, the content of some representations possibly being such as cannot be replied to, though the position of the clause naturally connects it with the language of a reply; this natural construction can nullify the provision!], in such other languages [i.e., in the language of the representations]".<sup>2</sup> The Government of India Memorandum<sup>3</sup> of 1956 appears to have been silent on this point.

Article 347 is even more important for the minority languages and linguistic minorities; and like Article 350, it has been in the Constitution

<sup>2</sup> *Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, (Fifth Report), 1963, p. 77.*

<sup>3</sup> *Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities (Third Report), 1961, p. 41*

since its inception. It reads:

On a demand being made in that behalf the President may, if he is satisfied that a substantial proportion of the population of a State desire the use of any language spoken by them to be recognised by that State, direct that such language shall also be officially recognised throughout that State or any part thereof for such purpose as he may specify.

The Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities in his Seventh Report 4, in 1965, informs us that 'the Presidential authority has not so far been exercised in the case of any language under this Article.' Writing a whole decade before the Seventh Report of the Commissioner, the States Reorganisation Commission<sup>5</sup> in 1955 had added the valuable information that it was "left more or less to the States concerned to regulate the use of the minority languages for administrative purposes". The President was thus virtually bypassed for the purposes of the operation of Article 317!

The Government of India, proceeding on the basis proposed by the States Reorganisation Commission in its Memorandum of 1956, went the whole way along the road and laid down specific proportion,—a procedure and a plan, though good for the present, providing as it does a uniform rule, is dangerous as involving numerical rivalry, jealousy, and consequent malpractices and severe tensions!

The recognition of any mother-tongue for official purposes according to the Government of India Memorandum is to be governed by the following principles:

1. A State should be recognised as unilingual only where one language group constitutes about [?] 70 per cent or more of its entire population and that where there is a substantial minority constituting 30 per cent or more of the population, the State should be recognised as bilingual for administrative purposes.
2. The same principle might [?] hold good at the district level, that is to say, if 70 per cent or more of the total population of a district consists of a group which is a minority in the State as a whole the language of the minority group and not the State language should be the official language in that district.
3. The arrangements to be made for the purpose of recognising two or more official languages in a State or district which is treated as bilingual will be without prejudice to the right, which may be exercised under Article 350 of the Constitution by any one resident in the State, to submit a representation for the redress of any grievance in any of the languages used in the Union or the State.

<sup>4</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 59.

<sup>5</sup> *Report*, p. 211.

4. In districts or smaller areas like municipalities and tehsils where a linguistic minority constitutes 15 to 20 [?] per cent of the population of that area, it may be an advantage to get important Government notices and rules published in the language of the minority in addition to any other languages or languages in which such documents may otherwise be published in the usual course.<sup>6</sup>

Another principle was enunciated afterwards in 1961 at the conference of Chief Ministers of States and Central Ministers. It reads :

Where at least sixty per cent of the population of a district speaks or uses a language other than the official language of the State, this language of the minority group should be recognised as an official language in that district, in addition to the State official language. Recognition for this purpose may, however, be given ordinarily only to the languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. Exceptions may be made in regard to the hill districts of Assam and the district of Darjeeling in West Bengal where languages other than those mentioned in the Eighth Schedule may be used.<sup>7</sup>

A few illustrative examples from the data furnished in Statement II of *Volume I, Part II-C (ii) of the Census of India 1961* will bring out the point I have made above. Quite a number of States have speakers of one language in the concentration of 70 or more per cent. Thus Kerala has 95.04 per cent of its total population who have Malayalam as their mother-tongue; and there is ostensibly no problem that will call for the application of the above-mentioned principles ordinarily for a long time to come. The highest percentage of minority-language-speakers, in this case Tamil, is 10.05 in Kottayam district. Well it would be interesting to watch any tension ensuing there, if the process of increasing the percentage to the minimum necessary for Tamil to get some footing in Official use of the district starts. Andhra Pradesh has 85.97 per cent Telugu-speakers, while Uttar Pradesh has 85.39 per cent Hindi-speakers. West Bengal's Bengali-speakers and Madras' Tamil-speakers form 84.28 and 83.17 per cent, respectively, of their populations. Bihar, on the other hand, is torn between Hindi and Bihari, the percentage of Hindi-speakers being 44.30 and that of Bihari-speakers being 35.39. But its official language as far as is known is declared to be Hindi! One may expect tensions there. For, though Biharis in their first flush of national sentiment had opted out for Hindi in the census of 1951, they clearly repented their action and returned to their Bihari in very large numbers, the inter-censal increase of Bihari-speakers showing the extraordinarily high percentage of 14611!

<sup>6</sup> *Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities (Report, 3rd)*, p. 41.

<sup>7</sup> *National Integration. Decisions taken by the Chief Ministers' Conference, 1961*, p. 16, para 12.

Later we shall come across the worst of purely linguistic conflicts of a violent nature in Assam, where Assamese-speakers form 57.14 per cent of the population and Bengali-speakers only 17.60 per cent. These latter form 78.77 per cent of the total population of Cachar District. And it was in respect of the appropriate official language for the State and the district of Cachar that the social tension burst the bounds and opened out into the violent riots. It is in the context of these riots and of the observation made above regarding the numerical fixing of language-status that as an illustration I have to mention the district of Nowgong, —where 17.32 per cent of the population is Bengali-speaking and thus minimally qualifying for the application of the principle of language for public notice etc.,—is not unlikely to be experiencing mild tension at present and getting ready for more severe ones in the near future!

In Bihar there has been so far no such incidents between Bihari-speakers and Hindi-speakers; but remembering the unlimited enthusiasm and almost frantic efforts of Hindi-speakers for the propagation of Hindi with scant regard for the interests of other languages, ugly situations might develop in such districts as Purnea, Santhal Parganas, and Saharsa, where Hindi-speakers form 47.48, 35.72 and 25.26, respectively of the population, or in the districts of Gaya, Patna and Dhanbad, where Bihari-speakers constitute 35.09, 28.90 and 14.31 per cent respectively of the population. The district of Ranchi with 25.53 per cent of its population speaking Bihari and 23.86 per cent speaking Hindi and a fair percentage speaking Oraon (Kurukh) or Munda the triangular situation may be showing signs of tension, in the endeavour of getting appropriate official status for these languages on the count of numbers, not detectable from afar!

West Bengal is better situated than Bihar in its linguistic set-up; but even there we can see in Calcutta itself the possibility of some tension, when Hindi-speakers who form at present 19.34 per cent as against 63.84 per cent who are Bengali-speakers ask for the operation of "the 15 to 20 per cent principle" in regard to language for official notifications etc. Similar appears to be the situation regarding Telugu in Madras City, where Telugu-speakers not so long ago were expecting the city to be at least divided between the States of Madras and Andhra Pradesh. Telugu-speakers, forming at present only 14.15 per cent of the city population, must be feeling the chagrin of having to wait for their language to get some status in official matters! Telugu-speakers, forming 20.01 per cent of the population of the district of Coimbatore and qualifying for official status to their language, might be contented and Tamil-speakers might have got resigned to the situation but in the district of Salem, another weaving district like Coimbatore, where Telugu-speakers form 14.82 per cent of the population must be giving some qualms to the local Tamil population!

The Governments of the three contiguous States of Andhra Pradesh, Madras, and Mysore have already modified one of the principles formulated

by the Chief Ministers' Conference for minority languages, the one regarding replies to representations etc. received in minority languages. They have ruled that replies in the language of the representation etc. will be given only if the minority language is the mother-tongue of between 15 to 20 per cent of the population of the area, i.e., in a situation in which it would be entitled to ask for all Government or other public notifications etc. being published in it. The Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities<sup>8</sup> has protested against it!

The State of Madhya Pradesh, with its enthusiasm for Hindi, with 10 of its districts already having more than 20 per cent of the population of each speaking either Rajasthani or Marathi, is perhaps in a worse condition. Moreover in one of these districts, East Nimar, Rajasthani-speakers form 26.14 per cent and Marathi-speakers 15.87 per cent, and present a triangular contest. Ujjain with 54.80 per cent of its population speaking Rajasthani can conceivably pose a worse problem for Hindi-speakers of M.P. and its Hindi-inclined Government in the near future!

Uttar Pradesh, the home of Hindi-enthusiasts, is confronted with Urdu-speakers who are much more determined, vociferous, and ambitious about the destiny and prestige of their language. The situation, however, has a relieving feature, that only 11 out of its 54 districts have a Hindi-speaking population of less than 70 per cent each. In 4 of these districts Hindi-speakers near the 70-per-cent or the 60-per-cent mark, Saharanpur with 69.86, Bijnor with 66.40, Moradabad with 66.13 and Dehra Dun with 59.53. The district of Rampur is bound to cause headache. The area is the old Muslim Princely State of Rampur, and the district has 43.35 per cent of its population speaking Urdu, which is the mother-tongue of only 10.70 per cent of the total population of Uttar Pradesh. With such strong concentration of Urdu-speakers, in view of the persistent, and under the circumstances unreasonable, demand of Urdu-speakers for Urdu being declared an official language of the State, I should be pleasantly surprised if there is no rivalry and competition for the increase of population of respective languages. If Bijnor, Moradabad, Saharanpur and Bareilly which have 33.20, 32.62, 27.92 and 22.20 per cent respectively of their populations having Urdu as their mother-tongue will not make the rivalry manifest at present, Pilbhit with 17.86 per cent, Muzaffarnagar with 17.77 per cent, Lucknow with 17.41 per cent, and Meerut with 16.61 per cent cannot afford to cultivate that much calm. Competition for increase of population, however small, in a country which not only for its self-respect but also for its very existence, must call an instantaneous halt in its reproductive activity, is a thoroughly disintegrative factor!

The part of the Constitution mentioned above in some details, was very keenly discussed for more than two days in the Constituent Assembly,

which had before it more than 300 amendments to dispose. The discussion fills 180 pages of the 9th volume of the *Debates* before it could be ensconced in the Constitution. Besides, in the discussion of the Fundamental Rights, the topic of the Official Language has its own corner. Some of the speakers were so outspoken that their remarks provide us with the danger-signals of linguistic tensions that were to come and force the attention of the national leaders, as they have done during the last decade. I shall quote a few of them.

To begin with the aspect of the complex of linguistic tensions which centres round linguistic minorities with mother-tongue different from those of the official languages of States, Mr Biswanath Das, an important political leader who later led the Orissa Government and was afterwards Governor of the U.P., gave vent to the feelings and facts about the Oriya minority in West Bengal. He said:

In Bengal in the Midnapore district, in the 1881 census, five lakhs of Oriyas existed. In the last census only a few thousands and perhaps in the coming census they will be completely wiped out. . . *The Oriya children of Midnapore have at present to study Bengali.* They have changed their names into Bengali names. So is the case in Madras in the Vizagapatam district where very large numbers of Oriyas, live and *it was their misfortune that the area could not become part of Orissa Province in 1936.*<sup>9</sup>

To follow up with remarks about Hindi as the Official Language, I shall begin with those made on 5 November 1948 by Mr T. T. Krishnamachari, who for a fairly long stretch occupied very important positions in the Union Government. Speaking in the Constituent Assembly he said about Hindi and the attitude of Hindi-speakers in the matter of the Official Language of India:

But if we are going to be compelled to learn Hindi in order to be a member of the Central Assembly in order to speak out the grievances of my people, well, I would perhaps not be able to do it at my age, and perhaps, I will not be willing to do it because the amount of constraint that you put on me . . . my honourable friend, Mr Satyanarayana, *who propagates Hindi in South India without effect.* . . *This kind of intolerance makes us fear that the strong Centre which we need, a strong Centre which is necessary will also mean the enslavement of people who do not speak the language of the legislature, the language of the Centre. I would, Sir, convey a warning on behalf of the people of the South for the reason that there are already elements in South India who want separatism and it is up to us to tax the maximum strength we have to keep*

<sup>9</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, 7, 1, p. 539, Italics mine.



those elements down, and my honourable friends in U.P. do not help us in any way by flogging their idea [of] '*Hindi Imperialism*' to the maximum extent.<sup>10</sup>

Mr S. Nagappa said:

I feel that my honourable friends from Northern India are taking undue advantage of the fact that they have learnt Hindi from birth ... that should not be the reason why these friends want to *force Hindi* on the people of Southern India ... *this must take time till all the people in this country become accustomed to it.*<sup>11</sup>

Mr O. V. Alagesan said:

The All-India University Teachers' Convention which recently met in Delhi under the chairmanship of a well-known political leader has passed a resolution that there should be a common script for all the Indian languages. When it is recognised that the various provincial languages of India are more ancient than the common language, Hindi, it will be realised that this step will cause great dissatisfaction and heart-burning ... *I do not want Devanagari Chauvinism to be continued in this country.*<sup>12</sup>

Mr N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar, who moved the adoption of the Part XIV-A — Language (present Part XVII, Official Language), himself was not in excellent spirits while doing it and he ended his introductory speech on a plaintive and nostalgic tone about Hindi replacing English as the Official Language. Said he:

Though I accepted the conclusion at the end that that language [English] should be given up in due course and in its place we should substitute a language of this country, it was not without a pang that I agreed to that decision.<sup>13</sup>

Seth Govind Das,<sup>14</sup> the staunchest protagonist of Hindi in Devanagari script as the Official Language of the Union, on the other hand, voiced his firm belief in the coming in of Hindi in these words:

Even then Sir Gopalaswami says today that he does not find any pros-

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 235. Italics mine.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 252-53. Italics mine.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 912-13. Italics mine.

<sup>13</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, 9, p. 1317.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1327. Italics mine.

pect of complete replacement of English by Hindi for a long time even after fifteen years. *I beg to tell him frankly that we [?] at least do not agree to this. . . Well, there is wide difference between us [?] and South Indian friends in this respect.*

Mr S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao (Mysore)<sup>15</sup> in his general remarks said:

*The southern languages of India have borrowed freely from Sanskrit. . . I feel that Hindi with Devanagari script would be acceptable to us, but I think that it should not be forced on us all at once, especially the vast numbers of people inhabiting the Deccan peninsula. It should be gradually introduced. We are prepared to accept Hindi with Devanagari script as the official language of India, but time should be given to us to pick up Hindi. . . . So also the sections of the people who have got the Urdu script should also be given time to pick up the Devanagari script as Begum Aizaz Rasul suggested . . . and I think it is better this question is left to the future Parliament to be decided. For the last two years, we have been wrangling over this question. It is unfortunate that we have not [?], though we have decided many questions by common understanding and adjustment, we have not been able to come to an understanding on this vital question. Sir, my submission, therefore, is that let the House accept my amendment to maintain the *status quo*. . . My respectful submission is that today Hindi is only a regional language and a provincial language and just because it is being spoken by about ten crores of people out of thirty-two crores, we are raising it to the level of a common language.*

Mr T. A. Ramalingam Chettiar<sup>16</sup> (Madras) said:

Sir, this is a very difficult question for us from the South to solve. *It probably means life and death for the South*, unless it is going to be handled in the way in which it ought to be done. . . I have been told by my friends of the North if they were to yield on the question of numerals, they will be twitted by their voters and that they will find their life difficult when they go for elections. *What will it be like when we, giving up our own languages, adopt the language of the North, go back to our provinces and face our electorate? . . . I may say that the South is feeling frustrated. . .* Sir coming here to the capital in the northernmost part of the country, and *feeling ourselves as strangers in this land, we do not feel that we are a nation to whom the whole thing belongs, and that the whole country is ours.* Unless some steps are taken to make the people in the South feel that they have something to do with the country, I do

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 382-83, 1335. Italics mine.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1371-75. Italics mine.

not think the South is going to be satisfied at all. *There will be a bitter feeling left behind. To what it may lead, it is not easy to say at present . . . The South is the only part of the country probably which does not feel it is going to come into line with the other provinces soon, especially any part of the country where Tamil is the language spoken. We have been priding ourselves that we have had nothing to do with Sanskrit. . . We have been trying to keep our vocabulary as pure as possible without the admixture of Sanskrit [?]. Now we have to go back upon all that. We have to take words from Sanskrit; we have to change our whole course of action . . . you are permanently handicapping us. Those whose mother-tongue is Hindi they learn only Hindi. But, we in the South, we have got to study not only Hindi but also our mother-tongue. . . There is also the regional language [?] we have to study that. Permanently, for ever, you are handicapping us by this arrangement. You in the North will have to realise what sacrifice we are making. . . It is much more the spirit that actuates the people that is so difficult to meet . . . but the way in which the Hindi speaking people treat us and the way in which they want to demand things that is more galling than anything which actually, is done or is going to be done.*

Dr P. Subbarayan,<sup>17</sup> who on an overall consideration thought that it would be proper "to adopt Hindustani written in the Roman script as the national language of the country", gave out some information about the career of Hindi in Madras. As it is very relevant in the context of the insistence on three languages at the secondary stage of education and the progress or absence of progress shown by that scheme, I shall quote a few observations of Dr Subbarayan. He said:

*If I tell you what exactly happened for three months when I was holding charge of the portfolio of education in Madras and Hindi was introduced as a compulsory subject in the first three forms of the High Schools, you will understand my anxiety that I should go back from here with something done, something accomplished. For three whole months, every morning when I got out of my house I heard nothing but cries of "Let Hindi die and let Tamil live. Let Subbarayan die and Rajagopalachari die." That was the cry that went up for three months and what is more, we were constrained to use even the Criminal Law Amendment Act which we railed against previously.*

It is seen from these extracts that Madras, i.e., Tamil opposition to Hindi was absolute; and it indicated an attitude which could be expected to lead to much further apparently on the road to disintegration! The farce of

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1401.

Hindi language having had to be compulsorily studied in these forms, the VIII to the X grades of today, was such as would surely stand exposed in its naked form as it did about 1963!

I shall now turn to the eastern periphery and quote a few remarks from the speeches of some of the Bengali members of the Constituent Assembly. Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra (West Bengal) said:

I can assure my friends from Northern India that if we cannot speak Hindi today, it is simply because we happen to be born in the *Eastern or Southern parts*. . . We want some national language for India but it is no use repeating *ad nauseum* the new dictum that independence will be meaningless if we all do not start talking in Hindi or conducting official business in Hindi from tomorrow. . . I can assure my honourable friends from the north that we have got every sympathy for Hindi, *but let them not in their overzealousness mar their own case. This is a sort of fanaticism*, which if allowed to grow and develop, will ultimately defeat the very object they have in view. *I therefore appeal to them for a little patience and forbearance towards those who for the time being cannot speak the language of the north.*<sup>18</sup>

Mr Arun Chandra Guha (West Bengal) observed:

I feel, sir, as in the Soviet Constitution, we should allow the eight or nine major [?] languages of India to be freely used in this House. As in the Soviet Constitution, by sheer weight of number the Russian language has all the predominance, here also, Hindi would have all the predominance by the sheer weight of number. There is no shred of doubt in the mind of any of us that Hindi is destined to be the national language and the language of the State in India, yet that should not mean *that other languages which have mighty literature, mighty traditions* behind them should not be allowed to be spoken in this House without the speaker declaring himself to be unable to express himself in Hindi or English. I would request that other languages should be allowed to be freely used in this House.<sup>19</sup>

Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee, an eminent educationist, the son of an even more illustrious educationist, and later a member of the Union Ministry though not a member of the Congress Party, said:<sup>20</sup>

"I am not talking about the relative claims of other languages. Left to myself, I would certainly have preferred Sanskrit. . . I do not want to take your time by dwelling on the claim of Sanskrit . . . but most certainly that

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 299. Italics mine.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 256-57. Italics mine.

<sup>20</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, o, pp. 1389-91. Italics mine.

is a language which still is the storehouse, shall I say the unlimited and illimitable storehouse, from which all [?] knowledge and wisdom are drawn, not so much perhaps by the present generation of the Indian people but by others who have preceded us and by all true lovers of learning and scholarship throughout the civilised world. That is our language, the mother language of India. We do wish, not for paying lip sympathy or homage to its genius, but in our own national interests so that we may re-discover ourselves and know the wealth and treasure that was accumulated in the past and are capable of achieving in future—we do wish that Sanskrit will reoccupy an honoured place in the national educational system of of India. . . *I am not similarly advocating the claims of other languages. . . All must feel that nothing has been done in the Constitution which may result in the destruction or liquidation or weakening of any one of these languages. . . Why do we accept Hindi? Not that it is necessarily the best of Indian languages. It is for the main reason that that is the one language which is understood by the largest single majority in this country today. If 14 crores of people out of 32 today understand a particular language, and it is also capable of progressive development, we say, let us accept that language for the purposes of the whole of India, but do it in such a way that in the interim period it may not result in the deterioration of our official conduct of business or administration and at no time retard true advancement of India and her other great languages.*"

The Bengali attitude, though critical of the activity of Hindi-enthusiasts was distinct from that of the Tamilians on two counts. First they would appear to have resigned to the acceptance of Hindi as the official language with much greater grace than the Tamilians. Such willingness on the part of Bengalis was the more praiseworthy and self-abnigatory because, first, the only internationally acknowledged literary figure of India was Ravindranath Tagore for his Bengali poetry and other literary activity, and second, Bengali, being perhaps the only Indian language in which the contributions of Muslims are far from being insignificant, represents the "compositeness" of Indian culture. The second count in which the Bengali attitude showed greater enthusiasm for national unity was the homage it paid to and the concern it showed for the common substratum of Indian culture, Sanskrit.

The third peripheral region of the country, the Punjab, too, struck a note of criticism of Hindi protagonists, a note which sounds as extreme as that of Madras, (Tamilnad) as represented by Dr Subbarayan, Sardar Hukam Singh,<sup>21</sup> who afterwards became the Speaker of the Loka Sabha and then Governor of Rajasthan, moving an amendment that instead of Hindi in

<sup>21</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, 9, pp. 1436-37.

Devanagari script Hindustani in Roman script should be the Official language, said:

Even after I was elected a member of this House and when this question arose here for the first time I was consulted by several members and I gave my unreserved support for Hindi in the Devanagari script. . . As the days have passed I have changed my mind. The most enthusiastic protagonists of this Hindi have alienated my sympathy and I must say that I agree with Mr Anthony. I am one of those who have withdrawn their support from Hindi in Devanagari script simply because of the fanaticism and intolerance of those who support it.

The remarks of the members of the Constituent Assembly quoted above and the attitudes revealed by them previsage clearly one type of linguistic tension, viz., the one created by or centring round Hindi in Devanagari script as the official language. However, they do not exhaust all the aspects of that tension. There is another current, which not only swells the mainstream of anti-Hindi tension but also produces a torrential eddy in a more threatening and dangerous spot. And that is the attitude of Muslim Indians towards Hindi in the perspective of their favourite Urdu. I shall quote a few remarks made by Muslim members of the Constituent Assembly in the matter.

Mr Hussain Imam,<sup>22</sup> speaking on 8 November 1948 in the general discussion on the draft Constitution, said:

The need for the continuance of the English language for the time being has been advocated by the South. But as far as Hindi is concerned there is no difference of opinion provided we know what is Hindi. . . We have been told, Sir, that in this respect, too, we are following the Gandhian conception. But people forget that Mahatma Gandhi stood for Hindustani to the last moment. He stood for Hindustani, in both Devnagri and Urdu scripts. *Devnagri, as far as the script is concerned has nothing to rival it. It is the best possible medium.* But what about the language? Hindi (you may call Hindustani), unless you mix it up with big Sanskrit words and fill it up with all common genders, is Hindustani. . . I suggest that Hindustani, written in both Devnagri and Urdu, which was the last wish of Mahatma Gandhi and the most accepted in India today, should be adopted as the national language.

Begum Aizaz Rasul<sup>23</sup> immediately following Mr Imam said:

"... Sir, the word 'Hindi' as it is being interpreted today is a very wrong

<sup>22</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, 7, p. 304. Italics mine.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 306-07. Italics mine.

interpretation. After all there is not much difference between Hindi and Hindustani. Every one will bear witness to the fact that the language spoken in the country, whether by Hindus or Muslims, is a very different language to that which is being described as Hindi and which is being advocated by the protagonists of Hindi. *What is advocated is Sanskritised Hindi which is only understood by a small section of the people. If we take the villages, the language spoken there is very different to what is called Hindi here. Then, Sir, I do not think that the forty million Muslims living in this country can immediately be asked to change their language. I agree that we have to learn Hindi in the Devnagri script, but some time must be given to us to effect the change over. . . I therefore recommend that whereas Hindi in the Devnagri script can be made the ultimate lingua franca of the country, a certain time limit, say about 15 years, must be given for the change over and until then Hindustani in both the scripts should remain the language of India.*"

Mohammed Hifzur Rahman,<sup>24</sup> moving an amendment that in place of Hindi Hindustani written in both the Devnagri and Urdu scripts should be the national language, desired that the Hindustani language "should be so developed that it may absorb Urdu, Hindi and all other languages of India". Waxing eloquent on Urdu poetry he maintained that its inspiration was Indian life and scene and illustrated his observation by instancing not only the mediaeval Amir Khusrau and modern Akbar of Allahabad but also Iqbal. He defined Hindustani as the language spoken from Bihar "right upto Frontier" and added, "If we leave the excluded area of the Frontier, even then the fact remains that this language is spoken and understood from Bihar upto East Punjab."

Quazi Syed Karimuddin<sup>25</sup> moved two amendments, one seeking to postpone the question of fixing the official language and empowering Parliament to pass an appropriate law within 6 months of its election and the other, in case the first was not acceptable, making Hindustani the national language. Arguing his case he said:

In 1947 the Indian National Congress had agreed to make Hindustani, written both in Devnagri and Urdu script as the national language of India, but today we are told that only Hindi in Devnagri script could be the national language. The reason for this change is . . . that after partition in 1947 Pakistan declared Urdu to be its national language, and so its reaction in India has been that Hindi in Devnagri script is being adopted. In this connection what I want to say is that along with Devnagri script you should agree to keep Urdu script also. Take the case of forty million Muslims of U.P., Bihar and Berar. At present they

<sup>24</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, 9, pp. 1339-1341-2.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 9, pp. 1366-67.

are getting education through their mother-tongue i.e., Urdu. Now, if you make Hindi as the State language, would it ever be possible for them to enter the Government service? You have provided a time limit—say 5 years or 10 years—to the other [?] languages for this change-over, but why not to Urdu [?]? I am not opposed to Hindi, but when Hindustani is our language then why so much aversion to Urdu? You have already agreed that English shall stay here for the next 10 or 15 years; then why you are denying the Muslims their rights by banning Urdu script?

Mr Mohammed Ismail<sup>26</sup> too moved amendments designed to enable the Assembly to accept Hindustani written in both the Devanagari and the Urdu scripts as the official language of the Union and to continue the use of English to an indefinite period, "until Parliament decides otherwise by a majority of the total membership of each of the Houses of Parliament".

It is seen that the burthen of the Muslim song in the Assembly was for the acceptance of Urdu, under the guise of Hindustani in Urdu script, as a co-language of the Union. The Muslim opposition was both to the language and the script proposed in the Draft.

In Quazi Syed Karimuddin's remarks occurs a reference to posts in Government service exposing one of the tender spots in the linguistic panorama, which received special attention of the members of the Constituent Assembly in connection with the consideration of an Article laying down the rights and duties of States in respect of the various services. Articles 282 to 282C of the Draft Constitution dealt with the subject of services. In the Constitution of India Article 309 covers it. It reads:

Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, Acts of the appropriate Legislature may regulate the recruitment, and conditions of service of persons appointed, to public services and posts in connection with the affairs of the Union or of any State.

The parallel Article in the Draft Constitution, was identical, yet Mr Satis Chandra Samanta<sup>27</sup> of West Bengal had tabled a proviso for it. It read:

Provided further that no person shall be eligible for appointment to any of the superior public services and posts in connection with the affairs of the Union *unless he is thoroughly conversant with any other regional language of India besides the National Language.*

Mr Samanta commended his amendment by mentioning first, the recommendation of the Universities Commission under the chairmanship of

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1472.

<sup>27</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, 9, pp. 1083-84. Italics mine.



Dr Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan that "every university should teach its students one other regional language of India, besides the State language and secondly, a similar resolution of the Language Convention". The amendment proposed by Dr Manmohan Das of West Bengal went a step further and appears to have been the parent of the idea and scheme of three languages, which taking shape in 1949 went through some transformations and received many more suggested but non-operative recommendations during the course of about 18 years. Dr Das'<sup>28</sup> amendment read:

Provided that, in order to be recruited for any of the posts in connection with the affairs of the Union, a candidate must be thoroughly conversant with the following languages: (i) The official language of the Union; (ii) The English language; (iii) Any other regional language of the Union except the official language.

In commending his amendment, which appears to me not only eminently rational but also highly desirable under Indian conditions, Dr Das said: "Sir, a section of the population, whose mother-tongue will be accepted by this House as the official language of the country, will have an undue and unjustified and inherent advantage over the sections whose mother-tongue will not coincide with the official language of India. In order to do away with this difference. . . At this stage the record of the debates makes it clear that Dr B. R. Ambedkar, the sponsor of the motion for consideration of the Article in question, unceremoniously butted in to stop Dr Das from proceeding further with the remark, "I think my friend has said enough on the point and he need not continue!" Needless to say with such attitude of the powers that guided the Assembly the amendment was negatived.

The Government of the Republic of India (Bharat) moved quick in the matter of the linguistic integration, without, it would appear, making much ado about it. The Ministers of Education of the then formed States meeting in 1949 adopted a formula which was to be implemented in the educational systems of the States. The part of the formula designed to provide just treatment for linguistic minorities need not be gone into as I have already indicated its operation in connection with the Constitutional safeguard under Article 347.

The part calculated to help national integration has been ever since referred to as "the three languages formula"; and the Education Ministers' Conference, taking their cue or not from Dr Manmohan Das' negatived amendment, put up a formula which resembled it. I shall deal with the second of the two alternatives proposed by the Conference as it was the one which we are told<sup>29</sup> was adopted by most of the States.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 9, pp. 1087-88.

<sup>29</sup> *Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities (Third Report)*, p. 8.

The 3 languages which were to be prescribed for compulsory study till the end of the secondary stage of education or the 10th Standard or grade were:

- (i) mother-tongue or Regional language or a composite course of the two or a composite course of one or the other of these two and a classical language;
- (ii) English or a modern European language, and
- (iii) Hindi (for non-Hindi-speakers)<sup>30</sup> or a modern Indian language other than Hindi (for Hindi-speakers).<sup>31</sup> The formula was later revised in 1961.

The revised form is rather ambiguous but in view of the explanation given in the notes<sup>32</sup> may be presented as follows:

- (i) The Regional language or the mother-tongue;
- (ii) Hindi, or in Hindi-speaking areas another Indian language;
- (iii) English or any other modern European language.

Thus presented the formula is essentially not different from the earlier one. It appears that the "and" of the original wording was really meant to add the study of mother-tongue, when it was different from the regional language and thereby to turn the formula into a four-languages-formula. People with Hindi as their mother-tongue but living in Calcutta could have done with the study of three languages:

- (i) Hindi and Bengali;
- (ii) Hindi, and
- (iii) English.

Bengalis living in Bihar would have similarly been able to do with three languages:

- (i) Bengali and Hindi;
- (ii) Bengali which is an Indian language other than Hindi; and

<sup>30</sup> *First Report*, of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities.

<sup>31</sup> In almost all documents in which the question of three languages is dealt with the expressions used are "non-Hindi speaking or Hindi speaking areas" but from the context it is absolutely clear that what is intended to lay down is a particular language to be studied by those whose mother-tongue is other than Hindi or by those whose mother-tongue is Hindi. *First Report, Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities*, p. 8; *Third Report, Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities*, p. 91; *National Integration*, p. 15 (para 9); *Report of the Emotional Integration Committee*, pp. 56-7; *Educational and National Development (Report of the Education Commission)*, pp. 188, 191-93, paras 8-10, 8.31, 8.32, 8.36 and 8.37.

<sup>32</sup> See above footnote.

(iii) English.

But Bengalis living in Bombay would have had to study four languages thus:

(i) Marathi and Bengali;

(ii) Hindi, and

(iii) English

Persons with Hindi as their mother-tongue and living in Bombay, on the other hand, could have done with three languages thus:

(i) Marathi and Hindi;

(ii) Hindi, Bombay or Maharashtra not being a Hindi-speaking area and

(iii) English.

To avoid such discriminatory treatment under a formula, whose purpose is to integrate the people and not to differentiate, we may have to take the expression "Hindi-Speaking areas" to imply persons whose mother-tongue is Hindi. With this explanation, too, persons whose mother-tongue is Hindi and are resident in Bombay could do with the study of three languages thus:

(i) Marathi and Hindi;

(ii) Marathi which is a modern Indian language other than Hindi and

(iii) English.

Persons with Hindi as their mother-tongue and resident in Calcutta, too, could have done the same, Bengali taking the place of Marathi in their case. Bengalis resident in Bihar, too, could similarly have escaped with the study of three languages thus:

(i) Hindi and Bengali,

(ii) Hindi, and

(iii) English.

Let us consider the case of Urdu-speakers. If they are resident in Bihar they would have to study:

(i) Hindi and Urdu;

(ii) Hindi, if "Hindi areas" is taken to imply persons whose mother-tongue is Hindi, as their mother-tongue is Urdu; but Urdu, if "Hindi areas" implies what it literally stands for, because these Urdu-speakers as resident in the Hindi-speaking areas have to offer any other Indian language than Hindi;

\* (iii) English.

If under the first requirement one language, either the mother-tongue or the regional language is to be studied as it has been interpreted, and I think correctly, in the scheme as implemented in most of the States, the Urdu-speakers in Bihar would study:

- (i) Urdu;
- (ii) Hindi, as their mother-tongue not being Hindi—the literal connotation of the alternative under the second head would require the Urdu-speakers to offer an Indian language other than Hindi i.e., they could offer Urdu and thus would go off without studying any Hindi at all. Hence that literal connotation cannot have been intended; and
- (iii) English.

The Kerala<sup>33</sup> Government actually gave for their non-acceptance of the formula the reason that the formula as straight-forwardly and literally interpreted would impose the study of four languages for students belonging to linguistic minorities whose mother-tongue is other than Hindi. The Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities states, without working out the full implications of such an interpretation of the formula, apart from ignoring the fact that the name of the formula would be a misnomer, that such a discriminatory element "is an inherent feature of the simplified formula". And in his VIIIth Report he repeats this indirectly by stating that "in the simplified three language Formula accepted by the Chief Ministers' Conference of 1961, the study of mother-tongue at the secondary stage of education has also been assigned an important position as under (a) of that formula the pupil has to learn 'the regional language and mother-tongue when the latter is different from the regional language.'"<sup>34</sup> The data he has presented in Appendix X of his Report under item F, pages 175-79, however, show that at best only one State, Maharashtra, can be interpreted to have taken the item in that sense, in so far as in the presentation (p. 178) there is no "or" between "Regional language" and "mother-tongue" but only an oblique hyphen. No other State in its scheme shows any evidence of such interpretation or acceptance of that item!

Before proceeding with the story of the implementation of the formula I shall point out a few of the many untoward and undesirable language-study patterns that emerge in the schemes of the Emotional Integration Committee and of the Education Commission (1964-66).

The scheme of language-study in the cause of "emotional" [psychological] integration proposed by the Emotional Integration Committee for "Hindi Area" may be worked out for Urdu-speakers and for Bengali-speakers, large numbers of both type being resident in Hindi area.

<sup>33</sup> *Fifth Report, Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities*, p. 39.

<sup>34</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 35.

## URDU SPEAKERS

*Standards I—V* : Urdu.

*Standards VI—VIII* : (i) Urdu; (ii) Hindi; (iii) English.

*Standards IX—X* : (i) Urdu; (ii) English; (iii) Arabic or Persian which is "any other classical language" alternative to Sanskrit, or Turkish or Malay or Swahili, which are "foreign languages" alternative to "Sanskrit or any other language".

*Standards XI—XII* : (i) Urdu which is "a modern Indian language other than Hindi"; (ii) English; or (iii) Arabic or Persian being classical languages; or (ii) Turkish or Swahili or Malay being "a modern foreign language"; or (i) English; and (ii) Arabic etc.; or (i) Arabic and (ii) Turkish etc.

## HINDI-BENGALI SPEAKERS

*Standards I—V* : Bengali.

*Standards VI—VIII* : (i) Bengali; (ii) Hindi; (iii) English.

*Standard IX—X* : (i) Bengali; (ii) English; (iii) Sanskrit or French.

*Standards XI—XII* : (i) Bengali; (ii) English or Sanskrit or French.

Thus the Urdu-speakers in Hindi area would have studied: (i) Urdu for 12 years; (ii) English for 7 years, and (iii) Arabic or Persian for 2 years and (iv) Hindi for 3 years or (i) Urdu for 10 years, (ii) English for 7 years; (iii) Hindi for 3 years and (iv) Arabic or Persian for 4 years or (i) Arabic or Persian for 2 years and (ii) Turkish or Swahili or Malay for 2 years.

The Bengali-speakers in the same area would have studied: (i) Bengali for 12 years; (ii) English for 7 years; (iii) Sanskrit for 2 years and (iv) Hindi for 3 years or (i) Bengali for 10 years; (ii) English for 7 years; (iii) Sanskrit for 4 years; (iv) Hindi for 3 years.

Urdu-speakers in Non-Hindi Area would have studied:

*Standards I—V* : (i) Urdu.

*Standards VI—VIII* : (i) Urdu; (ii) Hindi and (iii) English.

*Standards IX—X* : (i) Urdu; (ii) English and (iii) Arabic or Persian or Turkish or Swahili or Malay.

*Standards XI—XII* : (i) Hindi and (ii) English.

Bengali-speakers (Hindu) in Non-Hindi area would have studied:

*Standards I—V* : (i) Bengali.

*Standards VI—VIII* : (i) Bengali; (ii) Hindi; (iii) English.

*Standard IX—X* : (i) Bengali; (ii) English and (iii) Sanskrit

*Standards XI—XII* : (i) Hindi and (ii) English.

Hindi and Tamil-Speakers in Non-Hindi area would have studied:

*Standards I—V* : (i) Tamil.

*Standards VI—VIII* : (i) Tamil; (ii) Hindi and (iii) English.

*Standards IX—X* : (i) Tamil; (ii) English; and (iii) French or Sanskrit,

*Standards XI—XII*: (i) Hindi and (ii) English.

In Non-Hindi Areas i.e., in their own areas, in Bengal and Madras, speakers of Bengali and speakers of Tamil would thus respectively have studied: (i) Bengali or Tamil for 10 years; (ii) English for 7 years; (iii) Hindi for 5 years and (iv) Either French or Sanskrit for 2 years. As 2 years' study of Sanskrit could have given hardly any knowledge of the subject we may take it that wherever possible French, supposed to be a little easier for study, or a modern Indian language would have been studied. Urdu-speakers in these areas would have studied: (i) Urdu for 10 years; (ii) English for 7 years; (iii) Hindi for 5 years and (iv) Arabic or Persian for 2 years.

Thus Urdu-speakers or Bengali-speakers in Hindi areas would have only 3 years of Hindi, the integrative language, and 4 years of language-study which in the case of Bengalis would be integrative with the main bulk of the people, the Hindi-speakers, but in the case of Urdu-speakers or Muslim Indians mostly malintegrative with that bulk. In the non-Hindi area the integrative Hindi would be studied by all these—Bengali-speakers, Tamil-speakers and Urdu-Speakers for 5 years each; and the non-integrative or rather malintegrative element in linguistic-study pattern, in the case of the last two groups is reduced to two years' study.

Let us see the position of the main bulk of the population, the Hindi-speakers. In Hindi area they could have studied:

*Standards I—V* : Hindi.

*Standards VI—VIII*: (i) Hindi, (ii) Sanskrit and (iii) English.

*Standards IX—X*: (i) Hindi, (ii) English and (iii) Sanskrit.

*Standards XI—XII* : (i) English or French and (ii) Sanskrit. In non-Hindi areas they could have studied:

*Standards I—V* : Hindi.

*Standards VI—VIII*: (i) Hindi, (ii) Hindi and (iii) English.

*Standards IX—X* : (i) Hindi, (ii) Hindi and (iii) Sanskrit.

*Standards XI—XII* : (i) Hindi and (ii) English. Thus Hindi-speakers in Bihar, U.P., Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh would have studied (i) Hindi for 10 years; (ii) Sanskrit for 7 years and (iii) English for 7 years, while in non-Hindi areas, i.e., say Calcutta or Bombay, they could have studied: (i) Hindi for 17 years i.e., for all the 12 years plus as additional once in *Standards V to VIII* and once in *Standards IX to X*; (ii) English for 5 years and Sanskrit for 2 years. Even if they wanted to study either Sanskrit or English or both more in place of their additional Hindi they could not have done so. They could only have devoted their years to the study of the regional language, as many as seven of them, five years taken off from the additional Hindi, and two years of the *Standard XI—XII* Hindi. Knowing the inclinations of Hindi-speakers in this matter, it would be too much to expect them to do so at the cost of their Hindi, whose additional study both renders the syllabus easy and adds to their prestige in their Hindi

milieu!

Altogether the elaborate scheme of language study set up by the Emotional Integration Committee is eminently suitable not only for malintegration but also for disintegration!

If the same scheme were read as for Hindi-speakers and for non-Hindi-speakers, instead of as for Hindi areas and for non-Hindi areas as it reads in the Report of the Committee,<sup>35</sup> then the differences in the pattern of language-study between Hindi-speakers and either Bengali-speakers, Tamil-speakers or Urdu-speakers would not have been so large at all, as can be seen by comparison with the language-pattern of the Hindi-speakers in Hindi area with that of the Bengali-Tamil or Urdu speakers in non-Hindi area of the Report.

That such an elaborate scheme of language study as that devised by the Emotional Integration Committee should not have brought on a reaction sooner than it came is a wonder when one remembers the fighting din on the language front from the days of the Constituent Assembly. The reaction which one sees mirrored in the *Report of the Education Commission* (1964-66) attracts our attention, therefore, without much ado. In the austere simplicity of its language-study pattern, the Commission appears to have forgotten that some minimum number of years' study is necessary for the generality of learners of languages in order that they may attain minimum proficiency in the use of that language, to understand, to speak and to write it. No doubt it speaks of higher level and lower level and lays down the general principle on the subject thus:

The degree of proficiency that can be acquired in learning a language at school depends not only on the number of years during which it is learnt but also on the motivation of the student, the stage at which it is studied, the types of teachers and equipment provided and methods of teaching adopted. A short period under favourable conditions might achieve better results than a longer period without proper facilities. While arguments can be advanced for introducing a child to a second language at a very early age, the provision of qualified and competent teachers for teaching the language to millions of children in our primary schools would be a very formidable task. The most suitable age for making the learning of three languages appears to be the lower secondary stage (classes VIII—X). . . In a good school, three years of compulsory study would probably be adequate for gaining a working knowledge of the third language.<sup>36</sup>

At the very outset of any valuation of this endeavour of the Education

<sup>35</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 56-7.

<sup>36</sup> *Report of the Education Commission* (1964-66). *Educational and National Development*, pp. 192-93.

Commission in the cause of "national development" or national integration, let me emphasize some important general points. First, the Commission, though in its theoretical apparatus argues against the period in years over which a language is studied being taken as a test or index of the depth of proficiency in it, in its actual recommendations it has no other standard than that of the period of years of study. The last sentence of the above quotation,—leaving out the qualification of a good school as the Commission envisages nothing but good schools and we have to take for granted nothing but so-called "good schools" i.e., only the kind of schools we have—tells us that the Commission is satisfied that "a working knowledge of the third language" can be gained in three years of study. It is necessary to note that the language is not mentioned, and one cannot forget, even the Commission will grant, I hope, that languages are relatively difficult or easy not because they are either first, second or third, in any scheme of language-study, but because of their intrinsic nature, whether they are of the same family of languages as one's mother-tongue or the medium of instruction,<sup>77</sup> and whether they are fairly often heard in their daily and actual use by the learner<sup>78</sup> or/and are handled by the teachers concerned with the same or almost the same efficiency and emotion with which generally one's mother-tongue is handled.

Further the lower and higher levels of proficiency or attainment in a language are a little later, straight-forwardly laid down in terms of the periods of its study thus (p. 193, 8.40, 1):

*The study of English and Hindi in our proposal, would be indicated, not in terms of years of study, but in terms of hours of study and the level of attainment. There would be two prescribed levels of attainment in each of these languages—one for those who study it for a period of three years and the other for those who study it for a period of six years. \**

I have not come across any statement regarding the level of attainment in these languages other than this, which is quite clearly in terms of years of study. Further, we have to assume, though the curious wording of the paragraph does not have it in so many words, that the hours per week and the total number of weeks per year devoted to the study of the languages in which levels of attainment are being prescribed, are the same in the two periods, the one of three years and the other of six years. For though the Commission, in the first sentence of the paragraph quoted, has mentioned hours of study as one of the causative or conditioning factors of language-attainment it has left out one other factor, and that is of the total num-

<sup>77</sup> Mario Pei, *The Story of Language* (Revised edition, 1965), p. 401; Frederick Bodmer and Lancelot Hogben, *The Loom of Language* (3rd impression 1945), p. 21.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 390.

\* Italics mine.



ber of years. The total number of hours devoted to the study of language must depend not only on the hours per week devoted to it but also on the total number of years through which this is done.

It may also be pointed out that the Commission has ignored the consideration of whether in general a language is better studied with a certain number of hours, say five, per week over four years or with ten hours a week over two years, though the total number of hours devoted to its study in both cases is the same. I think most linguists would agree that the former dispensation would lead to better results.

The second point is about an objective standard for assessing attainment of proficiency in language. The Commission has not laid down any objective test. This is the more surprising in view of the fact that the educational system of the U.S.S.R., to judge even from the scanty literature in English bearing on the subject, has been having such a standard for the last many years. And the Commission informs us that it had special Russian advisers and access to unpublished documents in the office of the UNESCO to acquaint itself with its educational system.

Beatrice King<sup>39</sup> informed the reading public in 1956 that in the U.S.S.R. "the vocabulary required for English, French and German by the end of the Secondary School has been reduced from 3500 words to 2500". This drop of nearly 29 per cent in the extent of vocabulary as the standard of attainment in a foreign language for the Secondary School-educated student population as a result of the educational reforms of 1951 reflects the confidence of the U.S.S.R. in the greatness and comprehensiveness of the Russian literature in all important and significant subjects. Yet mastery over 2500 words of a foreign language, not belonging to the same Slavonic group of languages as the Russian, is an indication of the objective test necessary for Indian students. The height of the standard of attainment set up by the U.S.S.R. educational system can be appreciated if the consolidated opinion of linguists is considered. Professor Joshua Whatmough,<sup>40</sup> the distinguished linguist of Harvard, informs us that in "this age in which words play a greater role than any that has gone before" it has been found that "command of the 3000 most frequent words in a continuous sample of 100,000 running English words gives an understanding of 95 per cent of all the words, and that 2 per cent more can be acquired by derivation from these".

The third point naturally arises out of the second, and is concerned with the question whether the three years' study which the Education Commission has provided for English or Hindi and the five years' period for Hindi or English as the case may be, is adequate, taking the usual hours of assignment for such study as being enjoined, for the attainment of such proficiency as is secured by the provision of 2500 to 3000 words of the lan-

\* <sup>39</sup> *Soviet Russia Goes to School* (2nd revised Indian ed., 1956), p. 95.

<sup>40</sup> *Language*, p. 5.

guage studied. The U.S.S.R. educational system according to the time-table furnished by Beatrice King<sup>41</sup> assigns almost 11 per cent of the total teaching time of Standards V to X inclusive to the teaching of a foreign language, its study being introduced in the Vth standard and receiving 686 teaching hours out of the total time-table hours of 6270.

The Hon'ble William Benton, a former U.S. Senator and Assistant Secretary of State, and at the time of his contribution, United States Representative to UNESCO, in his special article entitled "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R." in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica Year Book 1965*<sup>42</sup> presents a syllabus of the six years of the Secondary stage of education in the U.S.S.R. which is very elaborate for the Standards V to X inclusive, covering as it does no less than 16 subjects, including astronomy, psychology, singing, trigonometry, mechanical drawing, shop-courses-work, and physical education. Over the six years of the Vth to the Xth standards, Russian Language and Literature receives 36 of the teaching hours a week and Foreign language 20: Foreign Language-study receives about 56 per cent of the time of that devoted to the study of Russian Language and Literature. Thus the testimony of the practice of one of the two educationally and technologically most advanced nations of the world today goes against the recommendation of the Education Commission that three years' study of a language can equip a student, going out at the end of the secondary stage of education, with a working knowledge of another language than his mother-tongue. One cannot possibly cavail at Soviet School equipment or teachers either! And here is a noted linguist testifying the same way. Professor Whatmough,<sup>43</sup> who is naturally not much enamoured of the study of an additional language, whether modern European or ancient, observes: "Those who are convinced that to learn at least one ancient or modern language is a valuable educational experience . . . should see to it that the experience is initiated not later than the age of ten, that it is continued uninterrupted for at least four years, and that it is given a fitting amount of time in the weekly time schedule."

The Education Commission (1964-66) plan, however, would defer the beginning of the study of English to not earlier than the 11th year. For its plan envisages admissions to Standard I at age of not less than 6 + years<sup>44</sup> so that in standard V we would have children of 10 + years.

The Commission has followed in the footsteps of the Emotional Integration Committee in regard to the pattern of language-study it has laid down for the two standards beyond the Xth. Of the five subjects two are compulsory and they are languages. Out of the remaining three one can be a lan-

<sup>41</sup> *Russia Goes to School*, 1984, pp. 67-8. Unaccountably the time-table is not reproduced in the Indian edition of 1956 of the book!

<sup>42</sup> P. 23.

<sup>43</sup> *Language*, p. 24.

<sup>44</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 30 (2.17).

guage. The two languages are to be chosen from the three (i) Any modern Indian language; (ii) *Any modern foreign language* and (iii) Any classical language. The third language that can be offered is not specified in the scheme.<sup>45</sup>

The inevitable conclusion from the evaluation of the pattern of language-study in the national system of education in India put up by the Education Commission is that it is ill-conceived and highly defective from the viewpoint of both educational theory and integrational need.

English, which is now an associate Official language, must be, as will be clear as we proceed, looked upon as a link language that will be there almost permanently. It is, therefore, worthwhile to study it well and to earn proficiency in it. In our context this cannot be done unless at least 8 out of the 12 years devoted to pre-college and pre-university education are assigned to its study with usual number of teaching hours per week.

Hindi, the Official Language, having a fairly large number of words which are met with in other languages of the VIIIth Schedule, can be and should be mastered with not more than five years' study. English, therefore, ought to be begun in the Vth Standard and Hindi in the VIIIth. Hindi should be considered to be the national-language in the making and as such may yield place to Sanskrit, in part or whole as an alternative, Sanskrit being conceived as the source-material of the national language to be, the competent vehicle of the "composite culture" of India (Bharat).

Before taking up the story of the three-languages-formula and its operation and implementation it would be worthwhile acquainting ourselves with the great experiment about the relative positions of the national language and the regional Republican ones and also about their writing in the great modern nation, U.S.S.R. The experiment, owing to the gigantic size of the country and the large number of languages and ethnic groups involved, deserves to be studied as deeply as possible in its own intrinsic worth. The urgency and insistence of such study is further whetted by references to the experiment in the Reports of the Emotional Integration Committee and of the Education Commission (1964-66).

The Emotional Integration Committee<sup>46</sup> pleading for the Roman script sought refuge in the history of the U.S.S.R. It informed its readers that "the autonomous Republics of the U.S.S.R. used Roman instead of Arabic during the transition for nearly 20 years before Cyrillic of Russian was adopted."

The Education Commission (1964-66) has a whole "supplementary note" on the "place of languages in school curriculum in selected countries", two paragraphs in which are devoted to U.S.S.R. They read.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 190, para 8.28. Italics mine.

<sup>46</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 52.

<sup>47</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 223.

In the primary school which consists of 7 years, Russian is taught from Class I onwards in Schools with Russian as the mother-tongue. In schools with a language other than Russian as the mother-tongue, as for example in Uzbekistan where Uzbek is the mother-tongue or in Ukraine (mother-tongue Ukrainian), the mother-tongue is started from Class I and Russian—the national language—from Class II. A foreign language is introduced in Class V in all schools. The three languages are carried to the end of the secondary stage.

Stating at this stage that the way the Emotional Integration Committee has represented the changes in scripts used by the Muslim Republics of the U.S.S.R. is rather misleading, I shall reserve a correct presentation of the actual state to a later occasion in this chapter. In the present context, I shall add a few relevant observations on the language-study pattern. I shall further mention a few facts regarding the actual position in the world of living and action, distinguished from the world of theoretical pluralism and educational plans, of the Russian language and literature to enable the reader to judge for himself the professions of the U.S.S.R. and the appraisal of the U.S.S.R. position regarding language-study, implied in the statement of the Education Commission as well as in its scheme of language-study.

Russians tell the world with natural pride that there are more than 120 nations and nationalities inhabiting the Soviet Union, speaking many tongues and having different ethnic features but making up "the close-knit, brotherly family of peoples of the U.S.S.R." <sup>48</sup> The "Declaration of Rights of the Nations of Russia" of 1917 made by Lenin and more or less incorporated intact in Article 123 of the 1936 Constitution of the U.S.S.R. reads:

Equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life, is an indefeasible law. Any direct or indirect restriction of rights of or, conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for, citizens on account of their race or nationality, *as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred or contempt, is punishable by law.*<sup>49</sup>

As regards language policy Geoffrey Wheeler <sup>50</sup> informs us that it has passed through several phases. The first declared policy was outwardly at least so liberal and decentralized "encouraging the literary use of regional idioms" to such an extent that A. Meillet, perhaps the greatest linguist of

<sup>48</sup> J. D. Desheriev, *Development of Non-Russian Languages in the U.S.S.R.*, 1958, p. 7.

<sup>49</sup> From Professor E. H. Carr, *Nationalism and After*, p. 65, f.n. 1; Desheriev, p. 8. Italics mine.

<sup>50</sup> *Racial Problems in Soviet Muslim Asia*, 1960, p. 36.

modern times, was led in 1918 to regret the linguistic decentralization and is said to have "consoled himself with the conviction that Russian would survive this apparent reverse".<sup>51</sup> W. K. Mathews, who is convinced that Meillet's commiseration was "gratuitous" even in 1918, made the following observation, in 1951, about the destiny of Russian in Russia's linguistic empire: "*The expansion of Russian, attested over so many centuries, seems whether desirable or not, to be an inevitable process, if only because the language remains the exclusive common medium of communication between one Soviet people and another.*" He declared the *lingua franca* Russian, then, to be the mother-tongue of about half the total inhabitants. Desheriev writing in 1958, and Mario Pei and Max Hayward writing in 1965 report almost identically.<sup>52</sup> Reinhold Niebuhr, who has given us the privilege of knowing some of the inner forces at work in this domain, assured us in 1959 that "the Russian language actually became victorious in the monolithic state created by the Communist creed; and *a multilingual nation became practically monolingual,*"<sup>53</sup> fulfilling an expectation of Stalin, expressed almost as a prophecy in 1950. To appreciate the stupendous nature of the national endeavour at its true scale one must bear in mind that according to a highly distinguished linguist<sup>54</sup> "the complexity of standard Russian" is so great that compared with it "even medieval or modern Latin is perspicuous". The observation of Bodmer and Hoggben<sup>55</sup> that "the archaic character of the Russian language is a formidable impediment to those who may wish to get first hand knowledge of Russian affairs through foreign travel" further underlines the magnitude of the Soviet linguistic triumph.

Apropos of what the Education Commission has stated about language like Uzbek in the Muslim Republics being studied through the secondary stage, it may be pointed out that Wheeler has called attention to the agency of the Cyrillic alphabet as a spreader of Russian and to the conscious introduction of Russian vocabulary and even grammatical and syntactical features into these languages. It is also asserted by him that a fairly large number of Russians have been implanted among these peoples of Muslim Republics. Wheeler informs us that according to the statistics for 1956 out of the total population of 24 millions (24,00,000) of the six Muslim Republics about 7 millions (70,00,000), i.e., about 30 per cent, were estimated to be non-native and predominantly Russian and Ukrainian.<sup>56</sup>

Whatever the professions about and whatever the practice regarding

<sup>51</sup> W. K. Mathews, *Languages of the U.S.S.R.*, 1951, pp. 115, 119. Italics mine.

<sup>52</sup> Desheriev, p. 11. Max Hayward and Edward L. Crowley, *Soviet Literature in the Sixties*, 1965, p. 123, f.n. 58.

<sup>53</sup> *Nations and Empires*, 1959, p. 169.

<sup>54</sup> Joshua Whatmough, *Language*, p. 62.

<sup>55</sup> *The Loom of Language*, 1945, p. 416.

<sup>56</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 29, 37, 39.

languages other than Russian, whatever their legal status, the total result is the enthronement of Russian above all and beyond the ken of all. The fact that between 1956 and 1962, 200 million (20 crores) copies of Russian classics were published in Russian and that they formed about 87 per cent of the total copies of such classics published in all the languages of Russia taken together,<sup>57</sup> is a clear measure of the dominance of Russian over other languages to the extent of their being looked upon as existing on sufferance and on the verge of extinction as literary languages of some significance. Between 1940 and 1961 the number of books and pamphlets published in Russian had increased by 61 per cent and was almost 74,000 in the latter year.

The number of copies published had, significantly enough, increased by 142 per cent during the same period and the total number of copies of these in the year 1961 were nearly 112 crores!

Here appropriately I may mention the endeavour and experience of U.S.S.R. in the domain of alphabet or the script for writing various languages. Desheriev<sup>58</sup> has quoted the following judgment of the linguist J. Vendryes about the relative merits of European alphabets based on Greek and Latin :

The first [based on Greek like that of Russian] were compiled with rare accuracy. . . The Gothic alphabet of Ulfilas is a splendid tool, sufficiently precise, but the Slavonic alphabet of Cyril and Methodius is a veritable masterpiece. How far removed are the alphabets of the Anglo-Saxons and the Irish! The latter have gone to great efforts over the centuries to adapt the Latin alphabet to their language but have not succeeded completely.

In the first five years of the Soviet system new alphabets were being attempted for the Central Asian and Caucasian Republics and we know that the Latin alphabets replaced the Arabic ones among them in 1923. As Shipley remarks: "In a way this brought the people along the same path that Turkey had taken" not long before. Pan-Turkish orientation began to peep in and though the sources available to me are not quite definite about assigning the change from the Latin to Cyrillic, i.e., Russian, alphabet to a particular year, it appears, from Shipley's observations, that it must have occurred in 1941. The sources of information are silent about the literatures of these Muslim Republics, if any, hailing from before 1941, having

<sup>57</sup> Max Hayward and Edward L. Crowley, *Soviet Literature in the Sixties*, 1965, pp. 162, 171.

<sup>58</sup> P. 19 — The quotation is declared to be from the 1937 Russian edition of Vendryes' *Language*, p. 296. Vendryes' book is known to us in its English edition of 1925 as *A Linguistic Introduction to History*. At page 329 of it occurs the following remark: "The fact is, of course, that the Latin alphabet is really inadequate for the purposes to which they endeavoured to put it."

been reprinted in the new script.<sup>59</sup> If they were not, it is clear that with one stroke two desirable ends were secured, which converged on the main aim of Russification of the Muslim peoples of the U.S.S.R.!

As for the praise of the Russian alphabet ascribed by Desheriev to Vendryes, let me point out that Desheriev himself has provided some data which properly interpreted cast doubt on its correctness. He<sup>60</sup> tells us that the Russian alphabet which has 33 characters is not comprehensive enough to accommodate all the sounds current in the other languages of the U.S.S.R. and that they are represented either by a combination of Russian letters or by additional diacritical marks or by "adding new letters to the Russian alphabet".

Bodmer and Hogben<sup>61</sup> go much further in the appraisal of the defects of the Cyrillic alphabet. The former tells us that it is "a hangover from their church-ridden past" that the citizens of the U.S.S.R. "still stick to 'Kyrilliza', a modified form of the Greek alphabet once current in Byzantium" and blames the Kremlin for having "made no attempt to bring itself into line with Europe, America, Africa, Australia and New Zealand by liquidating the cultural handicap of the Cyrillic alphabet."

While I am on the endeavour of the U.S.S.R. regarding uniform alphabet along with the penetration of the national language, I should emphasize a point which incidentally I have made above and which requires to be stressed over and over again in view of the many and vociferous suggestions and even demands made for a complete change-over either to the Devanagari or to the Roman alphabet by all or most of the languages of the VIIIth Schedule of the Indian Constitution. The Harvard linguist Professor Joshua Whatmough,<sup>62</sup> while admitting in respect of English that "its antiquarian spelling is a great stumbling block to further progress", has pointed out that "the most serious obstacle to the introduction of a better orthographic system is, after sheer inertia, *the economic one that all previously printed English books and papers would immediately become out-dated* [and I should add, even unintelligible]". In the case of the kind of complete change-over that is being suggested for Indian languages, adoption of it would require tremendous sums of money and large locking in of technical staff and materials for printing the superseded texts in the new alphabet!

We have seen that the Constitution of India has laid down that the Official Language of India (Bharat) shall be Hindi written in Devanagari script. In the discussion of the particular Article and of some others, too, in the Constituent Assembly demands were made either for the Urdu script being

<sup>59</sup> Joseph T. Shipley, *Encyclopaedia of Literature*, Vol. II, p. 951; Desheriev, pp. 19-20. Max Hayward and Edward Crowley, *Soviet Literature in the Sixties*, p. 167.

<sup>60</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

<sup>61</sup> *The Loom of Language*, pp. 414, 416. Italics mine.

<sup>62</sup> *Language*, p. 59.

alternate with Devanagari or for the Roman or Latin script taking the place of Devanagari as the only official script for the Official Hindi.

The demand stems from much older period and more complex situation that then existed. I shall mention here a few incidental points from a book written by a Muslim in about 1924. Sayyid Abdul Latif<sup>63</sup> while examining the influence of English on Urdu Literature appraised the Indian world of this novel discovery that Urdu which had won "a more or less recognised position as the common language of India", was extending its influence far beyond the confines of then India into "Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Southern Persia, Mesopotamia, Hejaz, the east coast of Africa, Burma and the Malaya Archipelago" to such an extent that it "*promises by virtue of its intrinsic qualities to play one day the role of the lingua franca of the East*". He asserted that the use of Urdu in the then India was not confined to "nearly two-thirds of Indian Muslims, numbering over eighty millions [8 crores]" but was current among "most of the Hindu urban population in the United Provinces and parts of the Eastern Punjab and the Nizam's Dominions [the then Princely State of Hyderabad]" who spoke it in their homes.\*

These claims were wishful dreams rather than any approximation to reality. But they were working as the leaven in the minds of Muslims of the then India and the whole dough effervesced on the formation of Congress Ministries and their regimes in the then Provinces in 1937. The Muslim League, among its other grievances, put forward the one about the attempt to drown Urdu in the guise of the sponsoring by the Congress Ministries of Hindi in the Devanagari script.

Professor Humayun Kabir, till yesterday a staunch Congressman and a high-ranking member of the Union Government for years, says:<sup>64</sup>

The question of a common language for India proved a cause of discussion; for here also the Moslems scented an attempt to impose Hindu culture upon them. Urdu and Hindi are basically the same language and differ only in their scripts and the proportion of Sanskritic to Saracenic [Perso-Arabic] words. Many Congressmen saw that the only solution was to adopt a neutral script, the Roman and facilitate communication between the two communities.

The revivalist element, goes on Kabir to tell us, did not see eye to eye and insisted on the Nagari script, the result being the Congress dalliance with the two scripts Nagari and Urdu. In practice, Kabir further assures us,

<sup>63</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 3-4. Italics mine.

\* On the history of the extent of and the propaganda for Urdu, Dr G. H. Mehkri's unpublished Ph.D. thesis, in the Bombay University Library, contains very illuminating chapters.

<sup>64</sup> Humayun Kabir, *Muslim Politics, 1906-1942* (1943), pp. 16-17.



the Nagari was "slowly but steadily crowding out the Urdu script". Professor Kabir records his final lament thus: "Nor can this always be prevented, for in areas where Moslems form a negligible minority, they are gradually forced by circumstances to adopt the Nagari script.

The year 1953 which registered the first post-Independence Muslim Conference also began an agitation about Urdu in Uttar Pradesh which has progressively grown and may be said to envelop the whole of India. The movement is double-edged. The direct one is designed to ask for special status to Urdu, the extension being only by way of making its field almost as large as India. The indirect movement takes the form of agitation for the Roman script for Official Hindi and/or also for English as the associate Official Language. The strategy, it must be pointed out, is to partially dethrone Hindi and at the same time to secure freedom from the study of Hindi and, if at all it has to be studied, then to provide for freedom from learning the Devanagari script, which to Muslims appears to savour of the Hindu.

The All-India Congress Committee was already possessed of the matter of the treatment of Urdu in the U.P. Mr Algurai Shastri, President of the Uttar Pradesh Committee, is reported to have stated that the demand of the Urdu-speakers for its being recognised as a regional language on par with Hindi could not be conceded (*Times of India*, 5-7-'53). Two days thereafter (*Times of India*, 7-7-'53) came the news that the Executive Committee of the Uttar Pradesh Congress Committee had reiterated its opposition to the demand made by Urdu-speakers. The resolution of the Committee did not stop at asserting that equal recognition of Urdu with the already existing State language Hindi would undermine the "unity of the State and healthy relations among the various communities" but also hoped that the Union and the State Government would realize the "harmful implications" of the campaign for the recognition of Urdu as a regional, i.e., associate State language.

That the view of the U.P. Congress Committee about the Urdu-campaign was not the obsessional reaction of the local Hindi-enthusiasts but a reasonable and rational sight on the scene became quite clear when three weeks afterwards the learned editor of *The Times of India* penned an editorial on 29 July entitled "Untenable Claim". *Inter alia* he pointed out that according to the Census of 1951 out of the total 632 lakhs [63 millions] citizens of the State [U.P.] only 43 lakhs [4 millions] spoke Urdu, 504 lakhs [50 millions] having Hindi as their mother-tongue. Further, only 5 districts had more than 2 lakhs of Urdu-speaking people each. 67 lakhs [6.7 millions] citizens were classified as Hindustani-speaking. He observed: "Urdu is not a dialect, but so far as its recognition as a second State language is concerned—and this means a colossal duplication and waste of effort in the transaction of government business its claim is no more tenable. . . There will be nothing more injurious to the interests of Urdu than

keeping alive a controversy \* which only embitters the relations between two sister languages." The editor did a disservice to the nation in stopping with "sister-languages" and not extending his observation to the feelings of the overwhelmingly large majority community which has the right to expect that its language shall be the official language of the State. The fact is that the editor saw only the cap of the iceberg and did not realize from it the bulk lying submerged. Later events have proved that it was only the thin end of a wedge to bypass the provisions of the Constitution or to bend them to the most favourable construction from the viewpoint of a minority. Soon the Government of the country must have seen the implications of the invoking of Article 347; for, as we have stated earlier in this chapter, a definite proportion of population is made the standard for the application of that Article.

The widening demand for the recognition of Urdu meets us even in 1966. It is therefore desirable to state the population-data of the 1961 census<sup>65</sup> here so that they can be compared with those of 1951 for U.P. In U.P. as a whole the Urdu-speakers form only 10.70 per cent of the total population. The Hindustani-speakers of 1951, it should be noted, evidently opted themselves out mostly for Urdu; for the variation between the Urdu-speakers of 1951 and of 1961 is plus 83.51 per cent, whereas for the Hindi-speakers it is only plus 23.70, i.e., more or less equal to the variation by natural growth. On the other hand the 6.7 million Hindustani-speakers of 1951 dwindled into only one lakh (one hundred thousand) in 1961! In Bihar the Urdu-speakers formed 8.93 per cent of the total population. In Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan, Urdu was not numerically important even in the third rank, that rank being taken up by Marathi and Bhili with 3.89 and 4.13 per cent of the total population respectively.

One feature often met with in the Urdu agitation is that Hindustani is the original language and that Hindi is being purposely differentiated from Urdu which originally was Hindustani spoken by Muslims. Hindustani written in the Perso-Arabic script is Urdu and written in the Devanagari script is Hindi. Originally Hindi did not contain Sanskritized words or idioms to an appreciable extent. It is even maintained by some Muslim writers that Hindi prose as most Urdu prose is post nineteenth century.<sup>66</sup> Without entering into any prolonged refutation of much of the stuff Muslim writers have put up on this matter I shall mention the most conclusive proof of the cultivation of Sanskritized Hindi prose which R. S. MacGregor<sup>67</sup>

\* The controversy was still alive when this manuscript was ready in mid-1967.

<sup>65</sup> Vol. I, part II-C (ii) Statements I and II.

<sup>66</sup> T. Grahame Bailey, *A History of Urdu Literature*, 1932, pp. 78-80, 83-90, 100. S. Abid Husain, *The National Culture of India*, (ed) 1961, pp. 96, 103; Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment*, 1964, pp. 245-46, 249, 254-56, 259-60; Muhammad Sadiq, *A History of Urdu Literature*, 1964, pp. 245-6.

<sup>67</sup> *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 1963, pp. 314-28.

has recently made available. He has commented on the Hindi prose of some Bhartrihari commentaries in early Braj Bhasa prose which hail from at least the 17th century as fairly deeply Sanskritized and as proving the cultivation of Hindi prose since two centuries before it began to be resuscitated at Calcutta under the British patronage.

Mr M. A. Qureshi writing on 10 August 1953 from Baroda dramatizing the situation of Urdu thus: "How tragic is the fate of Urdu! What was once its strength is now its weakness", conveys to his readers "the incontrovertible fact", as he calls it that "what the people speak in U.P. is Urdu or Hindustani and not the Hindi exemplified in the translation of the Constitution of India—a Hindi designedly made understandable by a coterie of benighted brains." He assures them further in the form of a question, to which he naturally expects or implies a positive answer but the actual facts of achievement and campaigns will not yield the same. He says: "When the people were willing to learn English will they not learn Hindi which is nothing but Urdu with some difference?" (*Times of India*, 17-8-'53). Four days after Mr Qureshi's confident assertion of the identity of Hindi and Urdu, Mr B. Sanyal from Bombay came out with his equally confident assertion that "Urdu is Urdu, Hindi is Hindi", which literally sounds more plausible, and adduced argumentative evidence for support. He said:

The syntax may be the same, but not the whole grammar. They may have a common minimum vocabulary, but that does not allow us to overlook the fact that Urdu is predominantly Persian-Arabic-Islamic, whereas Hindi is predominantly Sanskrit-Hindu. . . . If we should not distinguish between Hindi and Urdu, than Assamese, Maithili [Bihari] and Bengali, for example, having the same script, same syntax and 95 per cent of the vocabulary common should be taken as one and the same language" (*The Times of India*, 21-8-'53).

The issue of *The Times of India* for 16 February 1954 brought the information that a deputation of Urdu-speakers with Dr Zakir Husain, the then President of the Anjuman-i-Tarqi-e-Urdu, as its leader presented to the President of India, Dr Rajendra Prasad, a memorandum signed by two million and fifty thousand (20,50,000) adults desiring the recognition of Urdu in Uttar Pradesh. It pointed out that the U.P. Government had flouted the "order" of the Central Government that the medium of instruction and examination in the junior basic stage must be the mother-tongue of the student. This was a real grievance no doubt; but it has also to be remembered that an amendment to one of the draft Articles before the Constituent Assembly making it obligatory to impart primary education through the students' mother-tongue was defeated!

•Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, then Chief Minister of Kashmir, winding up the proceedings of the All-India Muslim Conference held at Lucknow in

the fourth week of April 1954, certified both to the correctness of the policy of the Government of India towards Muslim Indians and to the reality of the grievances of Muslims voiced in a number of resolutions adopted by the Conference. The Conference in one of its resolutions demanded that Urdu be recognized as a "regional" i.e., official, language in all States "where those speaking Urdu constitute a substantial proportion of the population" (*Times of India*, 26-4-'54).

Bihar joined the U.P. in July of the same year by demanding that Urdu be made a "regional" language in an Urdu-convention held "on a pompous scale". It was announced in the meeting that one million signatures had been obtained on a petition for the demand which was to be presented to the President. During the course of the discussion the statement of the Bihar Government made in the Assembly that Urdu-speakers in Bihar numbered one million (ten lakhs) was rebutted and it was asserted that they numbered 8 millions (80 lakhs). The 1961 Census reveals that Urdu-speakers numbered only a little over four millions and that in 1951 they were more than 26 lakhs (2.6 millions)! Mr A. Q. Ansari, former P. W. D. Minister, seconding the resolution about Urdu assured the people that "the demand was not actuated by the motive of pushing Urdu to the same status as Hindi". It was stated by the speakers that "the specific purposes for which Urdu was sought to be recognized, according to the resolution, were: primary education should be imparted to Urdu-speaking children through the medium of Urdu and in the Urdu script; there should exist adequate facilities for the teaching of Urdu in the Urdu script from the secondary to university stage of education . . . legislators should have full facilities to speak in Urdu in the legislature and there should exist arrangements for them to be officially reported in Urdu . . . all documents such as electoral rolls, Government notifications, rationing cards, press notes, etc. should be prepared through the medium of Urdu also and in the Urdu script and all Government signboards should also be in Urdu as well as in Hindi." Pandit Kisun Prasad Kaul of Lucknow who presided over the Convention asked all lovers of Urdu not only to "eschew foreign influences but also to take to the Devanagari script" (*Times of India*, 9-7-'54)!

A month later the Urdu Convention held at Bhopal decided to adopt all constitutional measures to secure for Urdu the status of a "regional language in Bhopal State" (*The Times of India*, 10-8-'54).

At the three-day session of the All-India Urdu Conference held at Hyderabad in the fourth week of May 1956 as remarked in the Current Topics column of the 25 May issue of *The Times of India*, some of the resolutions passed "went a little too far". One such resolution demanded that "minutes of municipal corporations, councils and assemblies should be kept" in Urdu.

About 18 months later, *The Times of India* on 21 November 1957 brought the news of a Delhi committee having recommended the recognition of Urdu as a regional language in Delhi. Mr B. N. Datar, then Minister of

State, stated in the Rajya Sabha that some representations had been received before the reorganization of States from the Anjuman-i-Taraq-e-Urdu asking for the recognition of Urdu "as one of the regional languages of U.P., Bihar and Rajasthan" (*Times of India*, 21-11-'57). The proportion of Urdu-speakers to the total population of Rajasthan even at the Census of 1961, as pointed out above, was less than that of the Bhili-speakers, which itself was a little over 4 per cent!

At the 63rd plenary session of the Congress held at Pragjyotishpur on 19 January 1958 Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan is reported to have said that "it was imperative to declare Urdu a regional language in the Punjab, Delhi, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar" (*Times of India*, 20-1-'58). On 17 February the issue of *The Times of India* carried the news that the All-India Urdu Conference held under the auspices of Anjuman-i-Taraq-e-Urdu evidently at Delhi demanded in a resolution that the President should declare under Article 347 Urdu to be a "regional" language "in all those States where it is spoken by a large number of people", and in particular he should declare it to be "a State language in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar". Within three weeks of this, the 42nd All-India Shia Conference, held at Hyderabad, requested the Government of India to declare "Urdu, a regional language in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Delhi, Bombay, Madras and other States" (*Times of India*, 7-3-'58)!

This almost hectic activity of Muslim Indians whether as individuals or through the Anjuman-i-Taraq-e-Urdu, during 4 years could not have permitted the editor of *The Times of India* to remain quiet but my file of cuttings provides me with his appearance only in July 1958. The issue of the paper for 21 July carried a leading article on the subject directly under the caption "Urdu", which was evoked by the press-note on Urdu issued by the Union Government. The editor rightly insists that facilities for education through Urdu to all who declare their mother-tongue to be Urdu must be provided in cities. The only drawback in this insistence is the absence of the specification of the grade of education. He further exhorts equally rightly that documents in Urdu should be accepted by all courts in States like U.P. On the other hand, he warns the protagonists of Urdu against impossible claims, and observes: "To make both Hindi and Urdu State languages in the areas where there are large groups of Urdu-speaking people will, apart from duplicating the work in every Government office, create many complications" without enlightening his readers, Urdu speakers in particular, on the nature of these complications. The editor towards the end of his leader declared the view, that Urdu is the language of Muslims, to be unjustified. He was sure that it belongs to both the communities. His view would be correct if a few thousand Hindus, who either speak or read or perhaps write Urdu, can stand for the Hindu community. The view declared to be unjustified is supported as correct by the proclamations of the Muslims themselves that it is their mother-tongue and is written in

what they call Koranic script!

The next day's issue of *The Times of India* contained the news that the U.P. Government had accepted the policy statement of the Union Government regarding Urdu. Within a month the then Punjab Government observing that Urdu could not be given the same status as Hindi and Punjabi expressed its resolve to accept the Union policy (*Times of India*, 13-8-53).

Professor Humayun Kabir, who was then a member of the Union Government, returned to the old topic of language through the backdoor of the alphabet in a special article contributed to the Republic Day issue of *The Times of India* in 1960. He tried to distinguish between alphabet and script and rightly maintains that there is no inherent connection between a language and the alphabet in which it is written. He admits "the superiority of Sanskrit alphabet" and discounts some extravagant claims made in that behalf. When he said that "all the North Indian languages have inherited the Sanskrit alphabet, but the script used is different" he falls into two errors. First he equates alphabet with sounds and second, he ignores the common derivation of the alphabetic, really speaking phonemic, writing of those languages from a common source, the earliest known type being the Asokan Brahmi.

When Professor Kabir ends his dissertation on script with the remark that "the only basis on which to prefer a script therefore should be clarity, legibility and capacity for easy manual and mechanical manipulation" he either ignores or forgets two important points. The first is that legibility is an attribute of writing not of script or alphabet, all alphabets or scripts are legible to their users, provided the characters are written in the standard or the usual manner. The second and the more important point is that the reasonable-looking proposition applies when there is no national script or alphabet. And that is just the misfortune of the so-called reformers and rational organizers that Sanskrit possesses a phonemic script, which competent scholars agree was worked out from some foreign script by Indian scholars, about seven centuries before Christ, to write their Sanskrit language, whose phonology and grammar they had worked out very scientifically. All the scripts of the languages of the VIIIth Schedule of the Constitution excepting Sindhi and Urdu are derived from that early script.

Diringer,<sup>68</sup> who is not very favourably inclined towards the endeavour of the ancient Indians in adapting a foreign script to their language as he points out their failure in one respect where the Greeks succeeded, sums up his view of the "Brahmi character" in these rather flattering words:

It is generally admitted that the earliest known form of the Brahmi is a script framed by Brahmins for writing Sanskrit, and it may be assumed that they were the inventors of *this essentially national alphabet*. . . *The*

<sup>68</sup> *The Alphabet*, 1948, pp 336. Italics mine

*fully developed Brahmi system, an outcome of the remarkable philological and phonological precision wherein the early Indians surpassed all ancient peoples, provided the various Indian languages with an exact reflex of their pronunciation.*

In the brief presentation of the situation regarding language-professions and language-actualities in the U.S.S.R. I did not enter into even the briefest of comparisons between the scheme of Soviet Secondary education and the scheme of Indian national education put up by the Education Committee and I have no intention of doing so; but the course of argument in respect of introduction of language-study and of the penetration of the Roman script forces me to do what appears like such a comparison.

Such an advanced nation as the U.S.S.R.<sup>69</sup> is satisfied with introducing the study of Physics in the VIth Standard and of Chemistry in the VIIth but the Indian Education Commission thinks it proper and necessary to introduce the study of Physics in the Vth standard,<sup>70</sup> the science subjects in the V, VI and VIIth standards being Physics, Geology, Biology; Physics, Chemistry and Biology, and the last three and Astronomy, respectively. Another contrast provided by the educational system of the U.S.S.R., a country where both Physics and Astronautics are, during the last two decades, so highly cultivated that the attainment of other nations in these subjects is quite often judged by it, is that there Astronomy at one hour per week is taught only for one year in the Xth standard.

Whatever justification for the specially early introduction of these subjects in the Indian national educational scheme, the argument advanced in support of its recommendation that the Roman script should be taught in the IVth Standard by the Education Commission is amusingly irrelevant. Says the Report of the Commission:

We also recommend that in Class IV, children should be taught the Roman alphabet. This is essential as the internationally accepted symbols for the units of the scientific measurement and symbols for chemical elements and compounds are written in the Roman alphabet.

Supposing that Chemical symbols cannot be represented otherwise than in the Roman alphabet, the students will meet them only in the VIth Standard and not in the Vth; and I am not sure that there will be many measurements in Physics of the Vth Standard, even if it is introduced there, that must needs be written in the Roman alphabet. It would appear that the Education Commission in this matter is guided more by its desire for innocuous penetration of the Roman script and the desire of some groups, like that of the Urdu-speakers, to avoid the use of the Devanagari script

<sup>69</sup> William Benton in *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Year Book, 1965*, p. 23.

<sup>70</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 198.

if they have to study Hindi at all. If the Roman script, out of the contextual schedule though, is already taught in the IV Standard, groups like that of the Urdu-speakers, which may have to study Hindi, can do so in Roman script, arguing that the students already know an international script and should not be forced to learn an additional script, the Devanagari.

In the words of the Commission, the argument takes the form of simple assertion that "it would be extremely convenient to begin the study of the third language by using a script already known to the student—Devanagari or Roman."<sup>71</sup> In so presenting the case for the penetration of the Roman script the Commission has either ignored the fact that the third language may be either Hindi or English; and that in its scheme<sup>72</sup> of study, it comes in VIII standard; or it wants all those whose mother-tongue is not written in the Devanagari script to study Hindi in the Roman script. For those who offer Hindi as the third language it is all right; for having learnt the Roman script in the IVth standard they will have kept their knowledge and mastery of it alive and complete when they come to the VIII standard and begin their study of Hindi in the Roman script. But for those who offer English as the third language, unless they have managed to learn their Hindi from the V to the VII Standard through the Roman script, it would mean learning the Roman alphabet anew as it is impossible to study English through the Devanagari script, and as they must have forgotten most of the Roman alphabet they learnt four years earlier and had not much occasion to use during the intervening period. The alternative that the Commission would like people, whose mother-tongue is not written in the Devanagari, to learn Hindi in the Roman script appears to be contradicted by its recommendation or injunction (?) that "the proper script [Devanagari] of the language [Hindi] may be taught later, after the student has mastered the language to a certain extent and been adequately motivated [?]"<sup>73</sup>

The Education Commission in its alphabetical philosophy and prescription has gone further and has enabled us to have a glimpse of its own motivation. Expanding its recommendation it states that "students of Hindi in non-Hindi areas may begin to learn Hindi in the script of their mother-tongue or in Roman". I take it the Commission has thought of Hindi-speakers in non-Hindi areas, and that its recommendation is purposely made for the benefit of non-Hindi speakers in non-Hindi areas. I make bold to ask the question if a student in Madras, whose mother-tongue is Tamil or Urdu, may study Hindi, which despite the fond hopes or wishes of the Commission will be studied, if its study cannot be avoided, only from the VIII Standard to make the period of unwilling study as short as possible, in Tamil or Urdu script, why may he not do the same in Hindi-areas, such

<sup>71</sup> *Report, Education and National Development*. p. 197, para 8, 44.

<sup>72</sup> See Chart on p. 94 of the *Report*.

<sup>73</sup> P. 197. Italics mine.



as Uttar Pradesh? And if Urdu-speakers in Uttar Pradesh may study in Urdu script which he would do from the VIII where is the occasion or what is the stage in the three-years course of the study, when he "may be taught the proper script of the language" and why?

And the question of questions is, if Urdu-speakers in Uttar Pradesh or Tamil-Speakers in Madras or for the matter of that in Uttar Pradesh, can study Hindi in Urdu script or in Tamil script, or Hindi-speakers in Uttar Pradesh or elsewhere may study any modern Indian language they may like other than Hindi in Devanagari script as the case may be, where is the need for the Roman script to be taught, separated from the study of English in Standard IV? Altogether there does not appear to be any other motivation in these recommendations than the early penetration of the Roman script.

The Commission's attitude to the Devanagari script, though it has bracketed it with the Roman script in the recommendations discussed above, appears to be one of antipathy parallel to its attitude towards Sanskrit. It has discovered that the very merit of the Devanagari script, that it is much more phonetic than most known scripts, is itself a defect under the circumstances of "educational research on teaching methods" obtaining in the country. The Commission observes: ". . . the best methods of teaching beginning reading in a phonetic script like Devanagari have yet to be developed".<sup>74</sup> The implication of this remark must be that till such culmination the script as defective must be superseded!

I have already stated both the sentimental and the purely scientific reasons that ought to bind Indians to the Devanagari script. The resolve with which the U.S.S.R. has stuck to and propagated its much more defective and much more recent script ought further to impel patriotic Indians to adopt the Devanagari script not only without grudging but also with positive enthusiasm. I shall add to these considerations in favour of the Devanagari script the testimony of a practical social worker, who has done more than a whole bunch of writers, linguists, politicians or pure educationists, to spread literacy among varied ethnic groups of mankind. Dr Frank C. Laubach, the founder of the World Literacy Movement and Director of the Laubach Literacy Fund, starting his crusade against illiteracy in 1929, is said to have taught 60 million (6 crores) illiterates to read in 168 different languages or dialects in 48 countries by 1960. And this is what this practical literacy-creator has to say about the Devanagari alphabet: "In India they had the same language, Hindi written with Sanskrit letters and Urdu with Arabic letters. Although the Moslems have put in more effort in their Islamic schools to teach the people than the Hindus did, the Hindus were ahead because it was easier, with the Sanskrit alphabet, which was perfectly phonetic."<sup>75</sup>

<sup>74</sup> *Report, Education and National Development*, pp. 224-25, para 9.03 (c).

<sup>75</sup> Quoted in *Symbology*, p. 92 — Ed. by Elwood Whitney, 1960.

Above, I left off the story of the endeavour of national integration through the three-languages-formula with the statement of the revised formula adopted in the Chief Ministers' Conference at Delhi in August 1961. Taking up the narration of the tensions centring round Urdu I briefly traced its history to 1960. In between, whenever context rendered it necessary or feasible, I introduced the discussion about script, which is both a tension-creating topic and an integrative or disintegrative agent, and the controversy about Devanagari script prescribed for the Official Hindi of the Union in the Constitution itself and the Roman script proposed by some. In the latter aspect of the controversy may be seen the shadow, or perhaps substance itself, of the Urdu campaign, objection to Devanagari script being one of the impelling forces among Muslim Indians. At this stage of the tangled skein of linguistic tensions it is both proper and necessary to break off from that narration to introduce another very poignant tensional situation in the linguistic field, as it burst out into an extremely ugly and riotous conflict about the middle of 1960.

I refer to the language conflicts in Assam which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, at the end of one of its bouts, is reported to have described as "the most ghastly and deplorable events in the country during the last 12 or 13 years—ghastly in their implications". Panditji was at his press conference, the purport of his announcement at which were reported in *The Times of India* on 12 August 1960, i.e., Panditji was pondering over the violent events that shook Assam and India since the third week of June to the first few days of July 1960 (*Times of India*, 12-8-'60) after they had cooled down to what appeared to be then at least normal condition, the scething anger having effervesced then and some kind of a lid having been put on it (*The Times of India*, 12-8-'60).

Violence broke out on 17 June (*Times of India*, 30-6-'60) when Assamese students took out a procession shouting anti-Bengali slogans, as the Bengali resident citizens of Assam were known to be opposed to and opposing the move to declare Assamese as the State language which till then was, of course, English. The Bengalis evidently were opposing the move because they rightly thought that those living in Cachar, a district of Assam, which according to the Census of 1951 had 77.14 per cent of its population and according to the Census of 1961 has 78.77 per cent of its population with Bengali as its mother-tongue, would be forced to take to Assamese.

It is curious, nay unthinkable defiant of the Union authority and of the Indian public opinion as represented by the States Reorganization Commission, that the Assam Government should not have straightway put a clause in its Official Language Bill exempting Cachar from its purview and permitting the use of Bengali language for the district as a whole without abrogating Assamese! Assam is the weakest of the linguistic States from the linguistic viewpoint as even at the Census of 1961, which cannot possibly be accused of partiality or tampering, the Assamese-speakers

formed only 57.14 per cent of the total population of the State. The States Reorganization Commission<sup>76</sup> had unequivocally asserted that only States in which the speakers of one language formed "about 70 per cent or more" of the total population should be considered and treated as unilingual States. The Union Government Memorandum of 1956, whose relevant provisions are detailed quite early in this chapter, had even gone further and suggested that districts having 70 per cent or more of its population speaking a language other than the Official State language should have the status of unilingual area with that language as the one language superseding the official State language!

According to official estimate 10,000 families lost their homes and 34 persons their lives in the disturbances. The Government of Assam sanctioned Rs. 36.55 lakhs for the relief and rehabilitation of the sufferers (*Times of India*, 29-7-'60). The Union Government later decided to share with the concerned States Governments (Assam and West Bengal) the expenditure on relief and rehabilitation and was reported to have sanctioned Rs. 1.20 crores (12 millions) to be paid to Assam and West Bengal for the purpose (*The Times of India*, 24-5-61).

The editor of *The Times of India* wrote a leader in the issue of the paper for 11 July on the subject heading it "Insanity Fair" appropriately adapting the title of Thackeray's novel *Vanity Fair*, and opened it with: "the people of Assam seem to be in the grip of madness".

In my incidental remark above, I have fixed considerable blame on the Assam Government; but that does not mean that the action of the Assam Government was unprovoked. The Bengali-speakers wanted that Bengali should be a second Official Language of the State of Assam and not merely an official language for Cachar on the district level. This attitude and the attendant propaganda, combined with the encouragement and perhaps even incitement from West Bengal, raised the ire of the Assamese people. Their memories of their Bengali superior officialdom were not very happy. Their wrath therefore transcended the usual bounds. The editor's analysis of the situation clearly brought out this and much more.

In his leading article in 10 August issue of his paper, the editor of *The Times of India*, rightly commented adversely on the "Union Governments' refusal to look the full horror of what happened in Assam in the face" by declining to order a judicial inquiry. He asserted that till then there was "no reliable estimate even of the riot casualties" and rightly emphasized that "no goodwill mission by itself will be able to dispel the climate of hatred and fear unless the people are assured that there will be no repetition of the kind of orgy or arson and murder that has disgraced the face of Assam".

To me the impression conveyed by the claims, demands by legislators

<sup>76</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 212.

and public men, and the frequent, fairly polite, but quite firm refusal and rebuttal of these claims and demands by the Assam Government and more so by the Union Government, was that this aftermath was the most enigmatic part of the whole sad episode. Going over the newspaper cuttings of the period at the time of writing this, I was even more puzzled by this aftermath of Governmental allergy to a judicial inquiry. The irony of the situation is heightened when one remembers that only in November 1959, barely eight months before the murderous and shameful affair stated, Bharata Ratna Govind Vallabh Pant, the then Home Minister, a reputedly strong man, second only to Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel among the Congress stalwarts, had presided over the meeting of the Eastern Zonal Council, comprising the four Eastern States, Assam, Bihar, West Bengal and Orissa, and had set up a committee with Dr B. C. Roy, the veteran Chief Minister of West Bengal and another Bharata Ratna, as the convener, the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities being an associate "to ensure the effective implementation of the recommendations contained in the Union Government's memorandum on safeguards to linguistic minorities" (*Times of India*, 14-11-'59).

Whatever the inhibitions for open discussion and expression of opinion or for a judicial inquiry the Assam and the Union Governments had, they did not exist for the West Bengal Government and the legislature. On 2 September 1960 the Chief Minister himself moved the resolution, which was passed unanimously and, among other things, demanded a judicial inquiry into the disturbances. In the discussion Mr Jyoti Basu "charged the Prime Minister with callousness and indifference" (*Times of India*, 3-9-'60) ! The question of a judicial inquiry was evidently pestering the Governments and responsible Ministers, individually, for 8 months even after the resolution of the West Bengal Assembly. In the meanwhile Bharata Ratna Govind Vallabh Pant had died and Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri, another Bharata Ratna, who was posthumously given that honour after his early demise in tragic circumstances in the cause of the nation, had assumed charge of the Home Department of the Union Government. And we read in *The Times of India*, (5-5-'61) that Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri had virtually ruled out "a general inquiry into last year's Assam riots—*contrary to the original undertaking given by the Prime Minister, Mr Nehru and the late Mr Pant to Parliament*" (*Times of India*, 5-5-'61. Italics mine).

The Assam Government had in the meanwhile proceeded with the Official Language Act as in the form blessed by the late Pandit Pant. Though, under the Constitution and the Government Memorandum on the subject, it was right and proper, as it permitted Bengali to be an official language on the District basis, it was not acceptable to the Bengali speakers of Assam. There were signs of a likely mass movement against it. And the editor of *The Times of India*, (15-5-'61) was good enough to warn the Union Government of its responsibility in the matter with a lucid leader

entitled "Warning from Assam". But his warning, strange to say and sorry to find, went unheeded. For on 19 May 1961, as previously declared by the Cachar Sangram Parishad, the organization, formed sometime back for the purpose of mass-movement called for a complete strike and organized picketing of all offices and transport systems.

On that day at Silchar 8 persons were killed and 21 wounded in police firing against the "satyagrahis" of the movement, army was called out and about 1000 persons were arrested (*Times of India*, 20-5-'61). The picketing and call for strike were so effective that news came of non-functioning of State Government offices and courts in Silchar even on 25 May (*Times of India*, 25-5-'61). And the same day's issue of *The Times of India* flashed the significant news that one Mr Tufijul Ali of Badarpur had donated a plot of land there "for erecting a martyr's memorial to pay homage to those who had sacrificed their lives for the recognition of Bengali as one of the State languages".

On 27 May came the news that six Congress M.L.A.'s from Cachar District had resigned and that the Cachar Sangram Parishad had called for a district-wide complete strike ('hartal') on 29 May, the day on which the ashes of the eleven persons killed in the police firing on 19 May at Silchar were to be carried in a procession to the spot where the obsequial rites, called "sraddha", were to be performed for the dead, who as we know were by then referred to as "martyrs" (*The Times of India*, 27-5-'61). The dictator of the Sangram Parishad Mr Paritosh Pal Chowdhury came out from hiding that day and led the procession. While announcing the suspension of the "hartal" he "categorically stated that the movement would be resumed and carried on until the Bengali language was recognised at the State level" (*Times of India*, 30-5-'61).

The agitation for inquiry and the intense tension demonstrated by the events between Mr Shastri's announcement of 5 May about an inquiry commission regarding the Assamese events of the previous year and the end of the month were such that a Commission of Inquiry into the police firing of 19 May was appointed by the Assam Government without further ado and was asked to report by 31 August 1961 (*Times of India*, 31-5-'61). Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri in an all-out effort was already at Gauhati busily engaged in finding out an agreed formula to resolve the severe tension.

While Mr Shastri was taxing himself and his persuasive powers to bring out an agreed formula, Jaya Prakash Narayan, many of whose pronouncements on crucial events during the last two decades have appeared to me to be not only unfortunate but also purely impulsive, was reported to have said at Calcutta that "Bengali should be given in Assam the status of a State language" (*Times of India*, 3-6-'61).

The issue of the *Times of India* for 5 June brought us the information that Mr Shastri was at Gauhati till at least 4th trying his level best. He even visited the scene of police firing of 19 May in the Railway yard where

11 persons were killed and more than 75 injured. On 6 June he announced his scheme or formula for the resolution of the tension. It appears Mr B. P. Chaliha, the Chief Minister of Assam, was agreeable to it. Only one important modification of or rather addition to the earlier formula, the one guaranteed by Article 347 as interpreted and applied in the Government Memorandum of 1956, needs be mentioned here. It is this: "*At the State level English will continue to be used for the present. Later, English will continue to be used along with Assamese*" (*Times of India*, 7-6-'61. Italics mine).

It is possible that the earnest endeavour of and the final solution offered by Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri were the result of his internal urge and did not require any external stimulus. Yet it must be pointed out that the editor of *The Times of India*—perhaps editors of other important newspapers too might have added their quota—who as we have seen was at it regarding the Assam situation, had penned an excellent editorial on the general and special problem, headed "Dangerous Drift", in the 29 May issue of his paper. The title of the leader itself is such that not only statesmen but also routine politicians should be attracted by it and should be inclined to pay heed to what goes under it. The editor wrote:

The kind of issue which has created an explosive situation in Assam is by no means peculiar to that State. There are linguistic minorities in almost all the States and the problems affecting them consequently demand a national solution. . . What is required is a formula acceptable to all or at least most of the political parties.

This and much more positive stuff like this the editorial offered to the public, lay or political, with the opening observation that Pandit Nehru's approach, as evidenced by his election speech in Orissa, was negative and thus not helpful.

How positively helpful to the resolution of the severe linguistic tension Mr Shastri's proposal was can be judged from the fact that Dr B. C. Roy, the Chief Minister of Bengal, was reported to have declared on 6 June, the day when Mr Shastri, leaving Gauhati for New Delhi, was greeted by Dr Roy at the Dum Dum airport of Calcutta, that the proposal met "most of the important demands" (*Times of India*, 7-6-'61). The editor of *The Times of India* in his editorial in the 8 June issue of the paper, too, wrote: "On any reckoning, Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri's mission to Assam must be considered a remarkable success". His comments on the important modification of the 1956 Memorandum in its application to Assam *vis-a-vis* the Bengali-speakers of Assam and Cachar which I have transcribed above are worth being borne in mind. I shall add another relevant sentence from the article. He said:

Moreover, if at the State level English continues to be used along with Assamese in the years to come, as suggested by the Home Minister, the linguistic minorities in the State will not be exposed to the kind of difficulties which at the moment they fear are in store for them [that they will have to master Assamese and thus progressively lose their Bengali or not do the former and lose jobs and suffer other inconveniences.]

The well-intentioned editor rightly but gently advised the Sangram Parishad to see reason and accept the solution and give up the agitation.

However, reason, which generally parts company with the coming of the mass movement, could hardly have been expected to accompany this Bengali official language agitation; and to make matters worse for reason to prevail, as already mentioned, political leaders like Mr Jaya Prakash Narayan had already blessed the extreme movement, which if successful, could have given Bengali the status of an official language almost on a par with Hindi and would have spelled the ruin of Hindi in Assam!

In *The Times of India* of 30 June we read that Mr Asoka Sen, the then Union Law Minister, who had "fruitful [?] negotiations" with the leaders of the Cachar Sangram Parishad was reported to have said at a press conference at Calcutta: "I have already received telegrams from the Assam Valley expressing deep concern over the situation" and to have expressed the fear that if the negotiations for a settlement of the language issue failed the entire State would be plunged in a serious strife (*Times of India*, 30-6-'61). It would appear that Mr Sen had used much stronger and more objectionable words. At least Mr B. P. Chaliha, the Chief Minister of Assam, three or four days later, is reported as having taken objection to Mr Sen's statement which according to him was "nothing less than inciting civil war" (*The Times of India*, 4-7-'61).

And this statement was made ten days after the occurrence of the Assamese invasion of the Bengali-speakers at Hailakandi on Monday 19 June, i.e., exactly a month after 11 peacefully striking Bengalis had fallen victims to police firing at Silchar! As the editorial in 23 June issue of *The Times of India* states, some 10,000 persons, presumably Assamese, converged on Hailakandi, spreading fire and loot directed at the Bengali houses and shops. The day originally was scheduled by the Sangram Parishad to be a district-wide "hartal" (strike) day but the call or the proposal was withdrawn, the whole agitation having been suspended on 16 June (*Times of India*, 1-7-'61). The police firing on this occasion, though it took a toll of 7 lives, was naturally held justifiable. The question loudly being asked was: how was it that the local administration allowed such a mass of people gathering together and proceeding towards a particular spot and not have it dispersed before it could form one mob?

The Chief Secretary of the Assam Government announced at Shillong on the night of 19 June that the police had opened fire twice and that

thereafter the military was posted in the affected areas (*The Times of India* 20-6-'61). The next day brought the news that the military was empowered to shoot at sight persons indulging in arson. On 20th night "a procession of 7,000 persons armed with lathis marched towards Silchar town". And that night more than 1,000 houses were burnt! (*Times of India*, 21-6-'61).

In the issue of the *Times of India* of 23 June it was reported that the Hailakandi affair was being tried to be made out to be a communal riot with the "convenient" Pakistani agents as the medium; and the Praja Socialist Party unit of the district was said to have demanded immediate action against Mr Haider Hussain, the Inspector-General of Assam Police, and Mr Moinul Huq Chowdhury, the Agriculture Minister, making an altogether confused picture of the whole scene! Mr Asoka Sen, addressing a press conference at Shillong on 23 June, denied the allegation of Mr Moinul Huq Chowdhury that it was a clash between rival groups that had caused the Hailakandi violence and added that in all language-agitational campaigns of the Sangram Parishad about 15 per cent of the active volunteers were Muslims (*Times of India*, 24-6-'61). We have already come across a splendid homage paid to the so-called martyrs of 19 May, the innocent victims of police firing, by a Muslim landowner, which is sufficient testimony to the fact of Muslims' support of the agitation. Add to this the fact that the President of the Cachar District Sangram Parishad at that time was Mr Abdur Rahman Chowdhury (*Times of India*, 1 and 3-7-'61) and then one has to put out of court the communal riot version of the Hailakandi invasion.

The disorder and fears of further trouble were so great that the Cachar District continued to be treated as a disturbed area till at least 21 September (*Times of India*, 5-8-'61)! It was on 24 September 1961 that the Assam Cabinet approved of the draft Bill to amend the Assam Official Language Act in accordance with Mr Shastri's formula mentioned earlier (*Times of India*, 25-9-'61). It was passed by the Assembly on 7 October (*Times of India*, 8-10-'61).

However, under the auspices of another organization called Cachar Zila Jana Sammelan, later in mid-December or so, a decision to launch another agitation to secure recognition of Bengali as an additional State language was taken (*The Times of India*, 28-12-'61—Current Topics).

On 31 January 1963 Silchar was rocked by violence, and a mob 1,000-strong in a riotous slogan-shouting bout burned down some 79 houses. On 5 February the Assam Government banned the entry within Assam of the Bengali daily *Jugantar* for two months and promulgated special provisions of the Penal Code for three months (*Times of India*, 4, 5 and 6-2-'63). The prohibitory order was, however, withdrawn on the 12th of February as quiet had returned (*Times of India* 13-2-'63).

The series of riots bursting out of linguistic tensions proper is the worst



and continued the longest; and that is why it has been dealt with as the most representative of the worst features of linguistic pluralism which calls for earnest and radical plan for their resolution. The riots came in the wake of the Presidential Order on Official Language of the Union which was issued in April 1960. A complete text of it is available in *India 1961*.

The anti-Hindi agitation was older and was being carried on by some sections on a rational basis without trying to turn it into a mass movement. Thus an organization calling itself 'Association for the Advancement of the National Language of India' convened the All-India Language Conference in 1958 at Calcutta, at which the late internationally known jurist Dr Radha Binode Pal and others contributed papers for being read, or addressed the gathering. The collection of these papers and addresses was later published under the title *Modern India Rejects Hindi*.

The opposition to Hindi began to stiffen in Madras State after the Presidential Order, in an open, and mass organised form; but that it was quite strong and effective in actual educational field ever since becomes evident when the operation of the three-languages-formula in Madras is examined. But before I do this, I must state in brief here that the impression one gets, nay the conviction one forms, as one reads through the newspaper reports about the implementation of the Official Language Article and the Presidential Order in that behalf in the Union Legislatures and the Uttar Pradesh Assembly, is that the Hindi enthusiasts declined to learn from experience or to consider the views and sentiments and problems of non-Hindi speaking peoples.

Here is a good specimen of the tug of war between Tamil Madras and Hindi-enthusiasts of the North: The issue of *The Times of India* for 9 July 1954 brought news from Madras that the Education Minister of the Kamraj Ministry, Mr C. Subramaniam, said that the study of Hindi in secondary schools was purely optional, *permitting* schools to open Hindi classes if they chose (*Times of India*, 9-7-'54. Italics mine). Within ten months of this declaration we have the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan meeting at Farrukhabad adopting a resolution "condemning" the current agitation in South India for extending the *period of 15 years stipulated* in the Constitution for replacing English by Hindi" (*The Times of India* 19-6-'55. Italics mine).

Mr Subramaniam, who took a leading part in the language discussion of the 63rd plenary session of the Indian National Congress at Pragjyotishpura, on his return from Gauhati, is reported to have told newspaper reporters in Madras on 21 January 1958, that the principle of bilingualism being accepted there was "no need to amend the Constitution, if English was to be continued along side Hindi as the official language". It was enough if Parliament enacted a law as provided for in the Constitution for the continued use of English (*Times of India*, 22-1-'58). On 11 May 1958, Mr Santhanam, a rather understanding person of reasonable mental

resilience, expressed the mild view that the present (1958) position should remain upto 1980, i.e., for a further period of 15 years after 1965 the position of English should remain the same as it was before 1965 (*Times of India*, 12-5-'58). That very day Mr S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao,\* Deputy Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, voiced in the lion's den itself at Agra a warning to Hindi protagonists against any policy of "haste" while addressing the annual convocation of the Akhila Bharatiya Hindi Parishad. He further pointed out that the progress in the propagation of Hindi made during 11 years was very little, of course regretting the situation (*Times of India*, 13-5-'58).

All fool's day of 1963 brought the disheartening situation about Hindi in the educational system of Madras into light of day through the column for Current Topics of *The Times of India*. As an illustration of educationists being susceptible as politicians to political pressure the columnist gave what he called "the new method of implementing the three language formula" in Madras. He stated that "students for the S.S.L.C. Examination are required to obtain minimum passing marks in the regional language (or the mother-tongue) and English (or any other modern European language) but the Part II language paper (Hindi or any other Indian Language) will not be considered for admission to college." The columnist rightly questioned the difference between the earlier practice of holding no examination in Part II language and the newer one, which I should describe in plain language as making a farce of the examination and throwing an insult at the official language.

As for the formula applied, the columnist, having made two small omissions, has failed to convey to the reader the impression that a serious and sincere attempt was being made to propagate the study of Hindi, which the actual wording of the formula was designed to create. The Part II language is not "Hindi or any other Indian Language" in the formula which has been in operation since 1959 to 1965 in Madras. The alternative to Hindi must be "other than the Indian language offered as the first language", i.e., other than either the regional language or the mother-tongue as the case may be. Secondly, a clear verbal contrast is presented in the wording of the formula which is calculated to create the impression that Hindi is looked upon with the same eagerness as English. The alternative language to English is not "any other modern or European language", which is the wording of the simplified three-languages-formula of 1961, but "any other non-Indian language". One wonders if the authors of the wording thought of the possibilities under it which I have expounded earlier in this chapter! But the purpose of contrast to any other Indian language is served.

\* The same gentleman, it appears, whose comments in the Constituent Assembly I have quoted earlier.

That the formula meant nothing as far as Hindi was concerned should have been clear to anyone who had read the brief news report from Madras that had appeared in *The Times of India* (23-2-'63) in which the Madras Education Minister, Mr M. Bhaktavatsalam, was reported as having told pressmen on the previous day that the decision to do away with examinations in Hindi in High Schools in the State was taken because pupils had not been taking them seriously. And one has to wonder at the nonchalance of the Education Minister when he goes on further to state that the marks in that examination had not mattered for the passing of the examination and to add still further that pupils could have taken Sanskrit or Telugu instead of Hindi for that paper! Why should have the pupils taken to the study of Hindi seriously under the circumstances? If we had such serious, sincere, and patriotic students and guardians, the endeavour of national integration undertaken by the 150 or so otherwise-busy people would not have been called for at all!

On 13 April 1963 the then Home Minister, Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri, introduced a Bill to provide for the continuation of the use of English for official purposes beyond 1965. The Bill did not satisfy Madras DMK and as will be mentioned in the next chapter the anti-Hindi-agitation in Madras was intensified. To highlight it I shall mention here two news items. The one as of 27 January 1964 (*Times of India*, 28-1-'64) states that one Mr Chinnaswamy, believed to be a supporter of D.M.K., had burnt himself in the early hours of Saturday, the 25th, opposite the Tiruchi railway junction. Of the two letters the 27-year-old man had left, the one meant for the police stated that he was burning himself to death because Hindi was "being imposed on the South". The other as of almost fifteen months later (*Times of India*, 17-4-'65) informs us of the view of this, and presumably of other such immolations, that Kamraj, the erstwhile Madras Chief Minister and the then Congress President, took. It reads:

Referring to these cases of self-immolation in Tamil Nad during the recent anti-Hindi agitation, he [Kamraj] said these "simple souls" laid down their lives out of their love for Tamil not realizing that the issue at stake was not the status of Tamil but one of how long English would continue to be the language of administration. In the end, only those who stood for English benefitted and Tamil was left where it was.

Compared with the news items the statement of 19 April 1963 made at Trivandrum by Mr R. Shanker, the then Chief Minister of Kerala, that "the over-enthusiasm of some people in the North to thrust Hindi on the non-Hindi speaking people of the South was retarding the progress of Hindi as the national language" not only was to be considered as hope-

\* See Chapter 11

fully anti-D.M.K. but also as active encouragement to sedate patience on the part of Hindi-enthusiasts. The statement of the Mysore Chief Minister, Mr S. Nijilingappa, reported as having been made perhaps a little earlier, that "though personally he had no objection to the Bill [mentioned above as introduced by Mr Shastri], Mysore would not like Hindi to be thrust upon it". Eighteen Mysore citizens, "including politicians, authors, journalists, educationists, administrators and others" issued a statement on 19 April which voiced a straighter opposition to Hindi, insisting that it was "undesirable to adopt, much less [more?] impose Hindi, a regional language, as the main or associate language" (*Times of India*, 20-4-'63).

Hindi-speaking members of the Loka Sabha, on the other hand, were so excited at the prospect of Hindi not being clamped down on the whole country at the stroke of the hour in 1965 that their behaviour was head-lined in *The Times of India* (14-4-'63) as "stormy scenes in the Loka Sabha". The passage of the Bill on 27 April came after 5 days of what *The Times of India* newsman described as "strenuous opposition" (*Times of India*, 28-4-'63). The editor of *The Times of India*, in his editorial headed "Hindi", appearing in the issue of 16 April, had already referred to the incidents of Saturday 13 April, when the Bill was introduced, as "thoroughly disgraceful".

The main effects of the Official Languages Act, 1963 are:

- i) The English language can be used in addition to Hindi even after 26 January 1965, for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that day; and for transaction of business in Parliament;
- ii) under Article 346 of the Constitution the language or languages (English and Hindi) being authorized to be used for the official purposes of the Union can be used for communication between a State and Union and between one State and another.

Turning to the effect of this legislation on national integration, I shall complete the Madras picture by the addition of one significant observation of Mr Kamraj himself. That the integrative endeavour is primarily to work through "the three-languages formula" is the view that has prevailed for the last 18 years as the foregoing brief statement must have made clear. One would have thought now that the continued use of English as an associate official language was legally established for an indefinite period beyond 1965, the non-Hindi States, particularly the two whose people staged the stiffest opposition to Hindi, viz., Madras and Bengal, would be so far satisfied that they would accept the formula and apply it in the spirit in which it was designed as an integrative agency. One had expected that mother-tongue, Hindi and English would be the three languages compulsorily to be studied, and the latter two with almost as

great a zest as shown in the study of the mother-tongue. But Mr Kamraj's declaration that "the three-languages formula" did not imply "compulsion to study Hindi under it", and his statement that this fact "must be made perfectly clear" made at Madras on 16 April 1965 (*The Times of India*, 17-4-'65) shatters all such hopes.

The Bengal scene, where the implementation of 'the three-languages formula' had not made the plight of Hindi pitiable, had by permitting Sanskrit to be studied for three years<sup>76</sup> provided for the integrational process only less directly, the mounting opposition to Hindi as the Official language took its cue from the 1958 Conference mentioned earlier in this chapter and as will be seen in the next chapter, took on the extremist colour, banning Hindi out of court! In extenuation of this stiffening of attitude, even though very partially, may be mentioned the closer impact of the activity of Hindi enthusiasts on the Bengali-speakers, particularly in Bihar and also the future repercussions on Bengali-speakers in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and more so on those in Assam. The editor of the *Modern Review* in his notes on the Language question in the issue of the Journal for September 1965 states, for example, that "the Government of Bihar lost no time in even Printing Cadastral Survey Maps of Bengali-speaking areas of Bihar in only Hindi (including numerals). The road signs, mile-posts etc., had already gone Hindi in areas where nobody belonging to the locality was Hindi-speaking."

Three Hindi States, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan, throughout have implemented the three-languages formula, avoiding the study of any modern Indian language.<sup>78</sup> From the tabular statement of the application of the formula as given on p. 176 of the *Seventh Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities* it would appear that in Bihar the third language for Hindi-speakers is any modern Indian language other than the one, mother-tongue or the regional language, offered as the first language. But as a large number of Bihar citizens have returned Maithili as their mother-tongue, in actual practice very few Biharis, if all, must be having to study a modern Indian language as the third language! Thus the Hindi States have more or less effectively shut out the modern Indian languages from their secondary education. The students of these States can go on with only two scripts, the Devanagari of Hindi and the Roman of English. The Bengali and the Tamil student if he has to study Hindi will have to master three scripts. Though I do not subscribe to the view that this is a frightfully difficult ordeal I can see inherent injustice in it!

The attitude of the Hindi States is further proved to be rather imperious in favour of their language which has become the official language of the Union, it appears, in all linguistic matters. The Urdu-speakers, to

<sup>76</sup> *Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, Seventh Report*, pp. 176-77.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 175-6, 179.

judge from the Third, Fifth and the Seventh *Reports of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities*, have made complaints which are many times trivial and sometimes even non-existent. I find that out of the total number of 103 complaints about language in primary education from all the States, listed in the Seventh *Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities*, 37 are by Urdu-speakers. Thirty of these 37 complaints are from the four Hindi States—Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan.<sup>79</sup>

Further indication of the differential attitude towards languages other than one's mother-tongue is provided by bilingualism which, as can be readily admitted, must be a strong integrative force in a multilingual State or nation. The language-wise percentage distribution of bilingualism is as follows:<sup>80</sup>

Hindi	—	5.10	Urdu	—	22.30	Sindhi	—	35.80
Assamese	—	9.00	Bengali	—	8.60	Gujarati	—	7.50
Kannada	—	14.40	Kashmiri	—	10.70	Malayalam	—	7.00
Marathi	—	10.30	Oriya	—	5.70	Punjabi	—	14.50
			Tamil	—	9.20	Telugu	—	14.00

The case of Sindhi-speakers is a special one. First, they are dispersed among peoples who speak other than Sindhi; second, among the Sindhis that left their ancient homeland a large number were of course well-educated ones. So the English-knowing and also the Hindi-knowing Sindhis number fairly large which account for the high percentage of bilingualism among them.

The case of Urdu-speakers is not at all as rosy as it would appear from the bilingualism percentage. For in the Andhra Pradesh, where Urdu-speakers number more than 25 lakhs (2.5 million) as against 79 lakhs of them in U.P., those who know Telugu, most probably their mother-tongue before they decided to shift their loyalty to Urdu, numbered more than 10 lakhs (one million) as against almost the same number knowing Hindi. The case of Tamil-speakers, too, is slightly more favourably coloured than it actually is. The case of Hindi-speakers is typically representative of their attitude!

Hindi propagation may be considered to be at least 40 years old as begun by the Congress and supported later partially for a decade by the Government. And at least for a whole decade before the Census of 1961 the propagation of Hindi was zealously, extensively, and expensively pushed by the Union and other Congress Governments. Add to this the quota, which ought in the ordinary reckoning to have been a big one, contributed through the compulsory or so-called compulsory Hindi of

<sup>79</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 152-171.

<sup>80</sup> *Census of India*, 1961, Vol. I, India, Part II-C (ii) Language Tables, C-VI, pp. 443-517.

"the three-languages formula" for secondary schools, and one has a right to expect big returns by way of bilingualism making for national integration!

The Census of 1961, however, fails to fulfil one's expectations, or even, as I think, to bring one some cheer. The total number of persons who know Hindi from among those whose mother-tongue is one or the other of the 13 languages of the Eighth Schedule, omitting Hindi and Sanskrit, are less than 56 lakhs (5.6 millions). The speakers of these 13 languages together account for less than 25 crores (250 millions) of Indians. There are 11 other mother-tongues whose speakers are returned as ten lakhs (one million) or more each. They are: (1) Bhojpurī, (2) Chattisgarhī, (3) Gondi, (4) Konkani, (5) Kumaoni, (6) Magadhi, (7) Maithili, (8) Malvi, (9) Marwadi, (10) Mewadi and (11) Santali.<sup>81</sup> Together they account for about 3.4 crores (34 millions) of Indians. And from among them a little over 13 lakhs (1.3 million) are recorded as knowing Hindi. Thus among more than 28 crores (280 millions), there were in 1961, i.e., after well over 10 to 15 years of effort, not even 70 lakhs (7 millions) Indians who knew Hindi though it was not their mother-tongue!

Now let us have an idea of the numbers, from among these more than 28 crores of Indians who were recorded at the same Census of 1961 as knowing English, which continues to be at least an associate Official Language of the Union. The speakers of the thirteen Eighth Schedule languages numbering less than 25 crores referred to above have recorded a little over 70 lakhs (7 millions) of them as knowing English. English-knowers thus have an edge over Hindi-knowers among the Indians whose mother-tongue is one of the thirteen languages, Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Kannada, Kashmiri, Malayalam, Marathi, Oriya, Punjabi, Sindhi, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu.

Adding to this number of English-knowing Indians the number knowing it from among Indians of 11 other mother-tongues which do not find place in the Eighth Schedule, we get 75 lakhs of persons as the total number of English-knowers. Thus even when the non-Hindi more or less total number of Indians are considered English-knowers among them are seen to be somewhat more than Hindi-knowers.

I have worked out the percentages of Hindi-knowers and English-knowers among Indians whose mother-tongue is one of the thirteen languages enumerated above; and I present them in a tabular statement overleaf.

It is seen from these figures, though I am not satisfied that they are quite free from doubt, that the progress of English-knowing is greater, than that of Hindi-knowing. And this in spite of the fact that English-learning

<sup>81</sup> I have left out one language recorded as Khariboli, because it is another name for Hindi.

<i>Mother tongue</i>	<i>Hindi-knowers</i> (per cent)	<i>English-knowers</i> (per cent)
Assamese	2.2	2.3
Bengali	1.8	4.7
Gujarati	3.5	2.0
Kannada	1.0	1.8
Kashmiri	0.8	0.4
Malayalam	0.5	4.5
Marathi	6.8	1.6
Oriya	1.7	1.5
Punjabi	7.4	4.1
Sindhi	22.4	8.9
Tamil	0.3	4.3
Telugu	0.9	2.3
Urdu	4.1	1.9

has not only been frowned upon but positively discouraged, as for example in the old Bombay Province and the successor States of Gujarat and Maharashtra, during the Congress rule of about two decades, in the Secondary schools.

The Hindi-speakers must be chafing at the situation. The Bengali-speakers and the Tamil-speakers, from what has been presented above regarding their attitudes, cannot but be expected to push on with English and push out Hindi as much as possible. The Urdu-speakers must be feeling deep chagrin at such a small number as only 2.2 crores (22 millions) returning the language, which they had prophesied nearly 40 years earlier as destined to capture the world almost, and which one of their leading lights, Mr Badruddin,<sup>\*</sup> had declared to be the second largest spoken language in the world so recently as in 1953. The Muslim Indians who in Bihar and U.P. had returned Hindustani as their mother-tongue in the Census of 1951 must have plumped for Urdu. Pakistani writers would certainly be pointing their fingers at Muslim Indians, as for example Mr F. Rahman<sup>82</sup> did in 1958 about their not having "intellectually expressed Muslim attitudes". Under these circumstances hardly can one expect the linguistic tensions to abate in the near future!



## CHAPTER

### 14

## INTEGRATION OR NATIONAL SOLIDARITY

Nations grow because the values and beliefs of separate population elements converge through common experience in thought and action; nations are also built, because leaders with an adequate amount of power in their possession *decide* to build one and thus to make a community where there was none before.<sup>1</sup>

CARL JOACHIM FRIEDRICH

Overwhelming and cumulative evidence points to the development of *integrative processes* among peoples and nations as the foundation of a viable society and probably the very condition of survival.<sup>2</sup>

PHILIP E. JACOB AND ATHERTON

*Environmentally*, integration fares best in situations controlled by social groupings representing the rational interests of urban-industrial society, groups seeking to maximize their economic benefits and dividing along regionally homogeneous ideological-political lines.<sup>3</sup>

ERNST B. HAAS

The history of national societies shows that no political, religious, economic or regional group has been able to withstand for long the temptation to advance its claims by violent means if it thought it could do so without too great a risk.<sup>4</sup>

HANS J. MORGENTHAU

SPEAKING OF NATIONAL solidarity in the seventh decade of the 20th century may appear anachronistic to those who have followed the woes of nations of Europe and their recent attempts at transcending the nation-state. Many students of Politics characterize the concept of "nation" as obsolescent while some go further and declare it to be obsolete. And these students, almost all European or American, hail either from the democratic tradition or from the totalitarian complex. Moreover, as Haas<sup>5</sup> has put it, "the scholarly community has long disagreed on the precise meaning" of the concept of "nation" and "nationalism";

Whatever the exact meaning of the notion of "nation" it is a fact that, in the world outside Euro-America, since the Second World War almost half a century of units, each calling itself a "nation" or a "state" and recognized and admitted as such by the great organization of humanity, UN, have come forward. And understanding writers like Haas are prepared to pronounce "the nationalism of the underdeveloped world [of the new nations]" to be "as rational as its approach to planning". For it is "a legitimate device of self-defence against the oversuccessful west".

A few years before the Second World War, in 1932 Ortega y Gasset<sup>6</sup> defined a "nation" as "an invitation issued by one group of men to other human groups to carry out some enterprise in common". The definition appears to be the most appropriate one in the sociological context. The importance of groups, whether one looks upon them as concrete entities to the exclusion of individuals or more logically and correctly as integrates not superseding the individual as a unique phenomenon in the final analysis, had come to be acknowledged, as pointed out in the first chapter, much before Ortega y Gasset pronounced his almost oracular judgment. A nation, whatever the characteristic constituent factors of it that were recognized as elements of the concept by earlier, and later, writers on politics, is above all a community. And usage whether in the form of nation society or national society testifies to the nation being looked upon as a community. We have therefore such an expression as national community or nation-community and latterly international community or world community, too, with the appearance of the UN and the rise of the European community.

Since Ortega y Gasset's time quite a number of careful and authoritative writers on Politics or/and social philosophers have described or defined the concept of nation in terms whose sociological content is patent, integration in some form or the other figuring in the description.

A decade after the abovementioned definition of "nation" Jaques Maritain<sup>7</sup> told the world that "a nation is a *Community of people who become aware of themselves as history had made them*, who treasure their own past, and who love themselves as they know or imagine themselves to be, with a kind of inevitable introversion". Quincy Wright,<sup>8</sup> in his ponderous two-volumed study of war, published about the same time, went a step further and asserted, in continuation of Edmund Burke's remarks, that "the nation may be defined as a *perfect community*". In the exposition of his view of "nation", Wright has dwelt on the relation of what is called State to Nation thus:

<sup>6</sup> *The Revolt of the Masses*, pp. 183, 197.

<sup>7</sup> *Man and the State*, pp. 4, 5. Italics mine and are intended to draw the reader's pointed attention to the fitness of the observation in its application to India!

<sup>8</sup> *A Study of War*, 1942, pp. 992-94, 1000. Italics mine.

Even though people feel themselves members of a group, that group is not an effective society unless it has the unity which flows from an organization and a procedure for manifesting the common will and giving it effect both internally and externally. The intensity of "nationalism" Wright measures by *the degree of resistance which the population offers to disruption of the nation state.*

Ernst Haas,<sup>9</sup> contrasting national states with international organization and affirming that both share "many of the characteristics of society", pin-points difference by asserting that "the national state also enjoys the procedural dedication of its members, who identify with it vicariously". Holding that "nation" is "a synthetic *Gemeinschaft*", it and nationalism "provide the integrative cement that gives the appearance of community" to the *Gesellschaft* produced by "industrialization and social mobilization-". Hans Morgenthau<sup>10</sup> speaks of "the national society" as an integrated whole set apart from other national societies", which "provide for their members the highest measure of social integration." For Carl J. Friedrich<sup>11</sup> 'in light of present realities, a nation is any cohesive group possessing 'independence' within the confines of the international order as provided by the United Nations". Even Rupert Emerson who is quite sure that "nation" is only a half-way house on the road to world community and world-state, nation is a "terminal community" for the time being "the effective end of the road for man as a social animal, *the end point of working solidarity between men*".<sup>12</sup>

How much social integration and nation go together in modern nations is very clearly brought out by the observations of the study group of the Royal Institute of International Affairs made in 1939, just on the eve of the Second World War and the comment made by Professor James S. Coleman in 1960 pondering over the situation of 75 underdeveloped countries of the world, including, of course, India. The study group in a straightforward manner equated a nation with an integrated society in its observation that "in every society sufficiently well integrated to deserve the name of a nation, there is a common conception, ill-defined and partly irrational, but deeply felt, of what constitute the 'vital interests' of the nation".<sup>13</sup> Professor Coleman, contrasting the modern politics of Britain and U.S.A. with those of the 75 underdeveloped countries included in the study *The Politics of the Developing Areas*<sup>14</sup> and summarizing the common features of the underdeveloped countries, observes: "A second com-

<sup>9</sup> *Beyond the Nation-State*, pp. 391, 465.

<sup>10</sup> *Politics among Nations*, pp. 38, 335, 511.

<sup>11</sup> Deutsch and Froltz, *Nation-Building*, p. 31.

<sup>12</sup> *From Empire to Nation*, p. 96.

<sup>13</sup> *Nationalism*, p. 245.

<sup>14</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 535.

mon feature of these societies is their lack of integration". Professor Coleman's remark emphatically predicates, of modern nations, the opposite and contrasting feature of integration. His exposition further leaves no doubt on the point as to what is meant by integration. Affirming that "pluralism is one of the key attributes of modern societies", he emphasizes the utter difference between this pluralism of modern national societies and that predominantly current in the underdeveloped areas of the study, the pluralism of the latter entities being rooted in the traditional and separatist divisive groups.

Movement for Indian independence had started almost a century before the event occurred and the organization for securing that end established in 1884 was and is known as the Indian National Congress. Indians, leaders and the led, both thus have thought of themselves as a nation for more than 80 years. The Muslim component of India before Indian independence, after very brief period of cooperation with the national movement as its part, soon began to think rather separatistly. Finally, about 1940 it adopted the views that the Muslims were a separate nation, distinct from the Hindus of India. This view very briefly referred to in another part of the work is known as the two-nations theory and was realized in the formation of the Muslim nation of Pakistan<sup>15</sup> and the non-denominational nation of India (Bharat) through the partition of British India in 1947.

Students of national movements like Professor Rupert Emerson and Reinhold Niebuhr have noted the phenomenon with particular care either for lessons to be drawn or as an illustration of theoretical propositions. Professor Emerson<sup>15</sup> observes:

The Moslem League was precisely a *Moslem* league and Pakistan was sought for explicitly to create a Moslem state, whereas the Congress always included Moslems, sometimes even in the highest offices, and the India which took over in 1947 was established explicitly as a secular state.

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr cites as a proof of "the unifying result of imperial dominion" the case of India, and "the inability of the two communities of India, Hindu and Moslem, to preserve their unity in one nation, the Moslems separating themselves from India and founding the state of Pakistan".<sup>16</sup>

The trauma of the operation had taught the leaders of India to look for integration and solidarity within the remnant national state which soon came to be named India (Bharat). The proceedings of the Constituent Assembly are replete with evidence of the earnest desire for and confi-

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 162.

<sup>16</sup> *Nations and Empires*, p. 174.

dent expectation of national integration, giving the Indian State that kind of solidarity which will enable it to play a significant role, commensurate with high and long historical tradition, its great extent and its large population.

In the chapter on linguistic tensions I have mentioned the development on the linguistic States front. The Dar Commission<sup>17</sup> appointed by the Constituent Assembly in that behalf in its report submitted to the Assembly in December 1948 recommended that the question of the formation of provinces [States] should be taken up when the country had been "*physically and emotionally integrated*, the Indian States [the old Princely States] problem solved" and "*the national sentiment strengthened*". Frank Anthony, the leader of the Anglo-Indian community in his speech, made in May 1949, used the expression "national integration" to denote the goal of the Constitution and of the endeavour of all Indians, and characterized "many of the requests put forward by the minorities" before the Constituent Assembly as opposed to it. He expressed his thanks for the accommodative spirit of Vallabhbhai Patel in conceding some of them in spite of their being untenable on the score of national integration. By that time the problem of the Princely States was solved, almost all of them having been, in the words of V. P. Menon, *integrated* into the Indian Union.

In spite of Dar Commission and its views the question of the formation of linguistic States, could not be indefinitely postponed, some of the worst cases of group violence having occurred in that behalf. And in December 1953, the States Reorganization Commission was appointed. The resolution of the Union Government appointing the Commission, having a close bearing on the part of Article 29, which speaks of the right of a section of the citizens to conserve its culture if it thinks that it is special to the group, may be quoted here as transcribed in *Report of the States Reorganization Commission* (1955).<sup>18</sup>

The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which is common in that area. In considering a reorganisation of States, however, there are important factors which have also to be borne in mind. The first essential consideration is the preservation and *strengthening of the unity and security of India*.

The Commission itself speaks of the *disintegration* of the then existing administrative units and *re-integration* of new ones and devotes a whole chapter to the theme of Unity and Security of India and follows it with a chapter on Language and Culture ending with a section on Culture.

<sup>17</sup> Report, pp. 34-5. Italics mine.

<sup>18</sup> Pp. 25, 29, 31. Italics mine.

The integration of Princely States and the re-integration of new States are quite clearly examples of physical integration and also perhaps of political integration. When the Commission itself speaks of "a *dynamic concept* capable of welding the nation together" as one which "*must transcend community and language and recognise the entire nation as one integrated unit*" it has in view what Mr Anthony characterized as "national integration", but oddly enough, also as "emotional integration".

In other parts of this work the agitational activity of the Muslims in India in almost a rabbid form, reminding one of the days of the first Congress Ministries and of the heyday of the Muslim League in and about 1937, which had begun in right earnest in 1953, is briefly described. The violent Hindu-Muslim clashes have shown no inclination to abate. And we learn from Pandit Nehru's address<sup>19</sup> to the Chief Ministers' Conference on National Integration on 1 June 1961, that his Government, was well aware, since the session of the Constituent Assembly, of the need for taking some steps to discourage communal organizations functioning in the political field.

Pandit Nehru opened his remarks with the text of a resolution which the Constituent Assembly had passed on 3 April 1948. It reads:<sup>20</sup>

Whereas it is essential for the purpose of functioning of democracy and *the growth of national unity and solidarity* that communalism should be eliminated from Indian Life, this Assembly is of opinion that no communal organisation which by its constitution or by exercise of discretionary power vested in any of its officers or organs admits to exclude from its membership persons on grounds of religion, race and caste, or any of them, shall be permitted to engage in any activities other than those essential for the bonafide religious, cultural, social and educational needs of the community and that all steps, legislative and administrative, necessary to prevent such activities should be taken.

Nehru informed the gathering that "certain instructions and executive orders were issued by the Government in furtherance of the resolution so as to discourage communal organisations functioning in the political field". It is clear from the resurgence of the Muslim League that these orders, which must have been issued even before the Constitution was adopted, had failed in the main objective. The deliberations of the Government on the situation and the resolution had convinced it, after the promulgation of the Constitution, that the resolution of the Constituent Assembly could not be given effect to in the legislative shape the Government had then thought of in view of Article 19(i). But the events of 1953, the Muslim

<sup>19</sup> *National Integration*, (Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting), 1961, pp. 28-30; *Times of India*, 2-6-1961.

<sup>20</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, 8, p. 315. Italics mine.

Convention or Conference at Aligarh with the din it made, roused the Government to further thinking very soon. And Pandit Nehru informs us that "the matter was further discussed in 1955 but it was decided [why we are not told!] not to introduce any legislative measures on this subject".

Though the Government and the ruling Congress Party wanted to let sleeping dogs lie, the linguistic turmoil and much more the Muslim League or Muslim Convention activities would not let the social scene rest in peace. That the subject was gnawing at the heart of Jawaharlal Nehru is clear from a speech he made at Bangalore in October 1955. He said: <sup>21</sup>

Let us, the citizens of the Republic of India, stand up straight with straight backs and look up at the skies, keeping our feet firmly planted on the ground, and bring about this synthesis, *this integration of the Indian people. Political integration has already taken place to some extent*, but what I am after is *something much deeper than that*—an emotional integration of the Indian people so that *we might be welded into one and made into one strong national unit, maintaining at the same time all the wonderful diversity.*

Professor Srijman Narayan, writing in *The Indian Review* of March 1956 speaks about the decisions, taken at the Amritsar session of the Congress a little before, with great enthusiasm and we have to conclude that a fairly large section of the Congress Party was intensely worried over the communal situation. So great was the relief felt and so high were his expectations of the effect of the decisions that he put the session of 1956 on a par with that of 1919 at Amritsar which had given "the country a new lead in political revolution after the Jalianwala Bagh tragedy". His remarks on the session of 1956 which are characteristic of the Congress leaders in regard to blinking at facts as far as the Muslims are concerned, are:

The 1956 Amritsar Session gave the country *a passionate call for national unity and solidarity after the sad and disruptive atmosphere in several parts of India, due to Reorganisation of States.\** The Akali Party and the Maha-Punjab Front also held their conferences simultaneously at Amritsar and the air was thick with anxiety and uneasiness: But the clarion call given by our great leaders to the nation found a wonderful response [later events have falsified this assertion in the hearts of the people and the atmosphere of uncertainty and disruption melted away like the morning mists. *The Amritsar Session of the Congress was thus instrumental in creating deep sense of national solidarity and emotional integration.*

<sup>21</sup> "From a speech at Bangalore, October 1955", as quoted in *The Report of the Committee on Emotional Integration* (frontispiece). Italics mine.

\* \* Italics mine.

The riots of communal origin between 1956-60, and linguistic violence, the purest and perhaps the worst specimen of which occurred in Assam in 1960, however, conspired to give some concrete shape to the internal feeling of uneasiness and urge to action in 1960. Perhaps the first of these concrete measures was the appointment of the National Integration Committee, either appointed at the Bhavnagar Session of the Congress as Jawaharlal Nehru<sup>22</sup> informs us or by the Congress President Sanjiva Reddy, at the request of the Congress Working Committee as *The Times of India* news (*Times of India*, 14-1-61) from Delhi has it. Another such step was the committee set up by the executive committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party the same year. It was later referred to as the A. P. Jain Committee and is said to have submitted its report in 1961. Intriguingly enough, its report was not out till July 1964 and we do not know the specific task entrusted to it. Evidently its main work was to find ways and means of characterizing a communal organization and to suggest appropriate legislative measure to discourage or stop them.<sup>21</sup>

The National Integration Committee, whose Chairman was Smt Indira Gandhi, was evidently asked to go into the complaints and grievances of the groups which had voiced them and also to put up a whole scheme designed to "create a national outlook" among the people. The composition of the committee further gives a clue to the group or groups which the Congress had in mind. Nine out of the sixteen members of the committee were Muslims, five Hindus of whom the Chairman was one, one Christian and one Sikh.<sup>23</sup>

The situation in the country on the eve of the appointment of these committees can be appraised very clearly from the following extract made from the main leading article which the editor of *The Times of India* penned in the issue of the paper on 23 September 1960:

The forces of disintegration can be seen at work in every sphere of activity, once the blinkers of wishful thinking are removed. The barriers of caste are as high as ever. . . . The Assam riots show that people in this country can be made to kill and plunder in the name of linguistic rights. And that was less than thirteen weeks ago. Religious bigotry, caste prejudice and linguistic rivalry are not the only divisive forces threatening national unity. Studied cynicism, widespread corruption and the lack of anything resembling integrity among those who provide leadership at various levels of national life have also become a serious menace to the country. . . . It is easy enough to denounce Mr Mohammed Ismail for reviving a blatantly communal organisation which cannot but harm the already fragile fabric of national unity. . . . It would be nice

<sup>22</sup> *National Integration*, August 1961, pp. 1, 21.

<sup>23</sup> *Times of India*, 6-7-64.

<sup>24</sup> *Times of India*, 14-1-61.



to believe that most Muslims are sensible enough to reject Mr Ismail's political leadership. But the pity is that his way of thinking seems to be shared by an increasing number of Muslims in Kerala, Madras, Andhra, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh.

With the urgency that was called for in the circumstances the Indira Gandhi National Integration Committee accomplished its task and presented its report by the middle of May 1961 so that the issue of *The Times of India* for 17 May carried a brief pre-review of it. And since then till the Chinese invasion of the country in October 1962, there was a plethora of conferences, committees, councils and their meetings and public interrogations and resolutions, all finally going to rest on the great discovery of national unity in face of the Chinese invasion and the rout in the battle field!

Before laying before the reader a resume of events as reported in the daily papers conjuring up before him a picture of the hurry and scurry over "integration", I shall dispose of the talk and proposal of banning what is called communal political organization, so rampant during the 7 or 8 years after the shock-giving proceedings and other circumstances of the Aligarh Conference of Muslims, fairly well described in another chapter. As stated earlier, Pandit Nehru<sup>25</sup> made an explicit mention of the Constituent Assembly resolution of 1948 in that behalf in 1961. It bespeaks rather too complacent an attitude on the part of the political leaders and the actual framers of the Constitution that they should have forgotten to put down an appropriate proviso to the Fundamental Right of Association, making it possible for Parliament to implement the resolution banning communal organizations for political purposes when and if necessary. It was the Aligarh upheaval in 1961 and the severe reaction to it in Western U.P.—and it must be remembered that it was the third time at least during 8 years that Aligarh was claiming the attention of the country as the storm-centre of Muslim communalism—that sent Nehru pondering over the situation rather hard. And the news service of *The Times of India* flashed, on 12 October, the information that the Union Government was deeply concerned over the ugly communal disturbances and that "the question of banning communal parties and organizations or otherwise circumscribing their activities is *once again* \* under consideration". evidently with the U.P. Government.

The Union Law Ministry was reported on 13 April 1961 to have come to the conclusion that "any legal ban on communal and religious parties from participating in politics will be '*ultra vires*', Article 19(c) of the Constitution which assures all citizens the 'right to form associations or unions'" (*Times of India*, 14-4-'61, 5-5-'61). Amendments to certain sections of the Indian Penal Code and of the Representation of the Peoples Act which

<sup>25</sup> *National Integration* (May-June 1961), p. 29.

\* Italics mine.

alone were found legally possible, were enacted in August 1961.

The great need and urgency felt for some more fundamental and drastic law to curb the growing communalism whether of the Muslims and the Muslim League or of sections of Hindus and the Hindu Mahasabha or the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, can be gauged from the fact that the question of banning by a blanket legislation all communal organizations was alive and agitating the minds of the Congress High Command and the Union Government a whole year after the clear verdict of the Law Ministry against such a law given in April 1961. A report of the proceedings of the Rajya Sabha, the Upper House of Indian Parliament, published in the issue of *The Times of India* for 20 March, 1962 ran: "The Union Home Minister, Mr Lal Bahadur Shastri, reiterated today [19th] that the question of banning communal parties through legislation was not ruled out." However, ultimately nothing came out of it; and as is evident from the chapters on "Some Thoughts and Actions of Muslim Indians", Muslim political conferences and Muslim League activities went on unabated, the Hindu Mahasabha in the meanwhile yielding its place to the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, an ostensibly non-denominational organization.

To follow the deliberations on national integration as a remedy against communalism one has to emphasize the composition of the National Integration Committee appointed by the Congress under the Chairmanship of Smt Indira Gandhi. The fact that the Committee had as its members individuals from the four main religious communities comprised in Indian nation—Muslim, Hindu, Christian and Sikh to name the communities in the descending order of their numbers on the Committee,—it is clear that the main apprehension of disunity or disintegration was thought to come from the communalism developed and indulged in by the four communities. The presence of nine Muslim members as against five Hindu and one each of the Christian and the Sikh communities *a priori* suggests that the committee's important task was to ascertain the appeasing common terms acceptable to the Muslims *vis-a-vis* the two smaller religious minorities and the rather amenable and yielding members of the majority community, placed in utter minority on the committee! <sup>26</sup>

The Committee appears to have submitted a unanimous report, sometime in May 1961 and the news borne by *The Times of India* dated 17 May assured the readers that though the committee while "stressing the need for a better deal to the minorities with a view to eradicating communalism . . . firmly rejected the plea for reviving communal reservations of jobs on the basis of population". From this ominous declaration one cannot but infer that reservation of jobs on the basis of "community" and its numerical strength, the most vicious single factor that can poison a nation to its very roots, was asked for by one or the other of the three commu-

<sup>26</sup> *Times of India*, 17-5-61.

nities, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs or all the three of them. Such a bold unnational claim clearly implies a hypertension and previsages serious trouble sooner or later, unless the integrative technique, whatever it is, in the meanwhile succeeds in arresting the rot.

The news item further stated that the committee "was of the view that the minorities should be provided opportunities of jobs in Government and semi-Government departments and the private and public sectors and also positive incentives to set themselves in industry, commerce and trade".

The report, as presented as an annexe to *National Integration* (May-June 1961), pp. 21-27 has nothing of the sort in it much [less is] there any mention of claim for reservation of jobs on the basis of community having been made. It speaks in terms of the anti-discriminatory provisions of the Constitution and positively only in terms of equality of opportunity as guaranteed by the Constitution. The special recommendations of the type, referred to in the news quoted in the last paragraph first bear on "facilities for professional and technical training"; and then only in a rather casual and indistinct manner, what is evidently a recommendation regarding jobs is made, which, as will be seen from the following quotation, starts off without mentioning jobs-procurement: "No proportions [of what? It should be borne in mind that the previous recommendation mentions only "facilities for professional and technical training".] can be fixed for minorities but it would be worth-while to examine the present position [of what? Mark that there is no reference to jobs so far.] and take steps to expand opportunities where expansion is justified. Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, Defence Establishments and Services, Police and the like, used to absorb a fair proportion. The position seems to have deteriorated now. There have been some complaints of discrimination which should be investigated". A more positive suggestion or exhortation refers to private establishments and enterprises, both Indian and foreign. These are told that they "can help in creating the right atmosphere by appointing members of minorities in high posts". It is further categorically asserted that "there is no dearth of suitable candidates".

*The Times of India*, on 18 May 1961, carried a leading article under the heading "Minorities". It begins with the expression of gratitude that the National Integration Committee "had the good sense to reject the proposal for reviving communal quotas for governmental posts". It is thus clear that there was a proposal for communal quotas of governmental posts. And the "leader" very properly styles it as "not merely foolish but also mischievous". It further and equally correctly castigates the committee for having given serious thought to that proposal. What the article embodies about the determination of the extent of discrimination against minorities in this behalf the committee was curiously innocent and unaware of. It is pointed out in the article that "no survey however exhaustive can determine to what extent the communal minorities are in fact being denied equal opportuni-

ties"; and ironically enough affirms that "the Muslims do have some cause for grievance".

The writer of the article, by this stage, manages to forget his own wise and judicious observations about the determination of the extent of adverse discrimination and quite emphatically asserts that there is such discrimination against Muslims. He says: "It is true for example that the educated Muslims' chances of employment are somewhat less than those of other educated Indians—and it may be added that foreign firms operating in this country have acquired the prejudices of the dominant group." This is a trebly irresponsible way of dealing with a subject, fraught with serious consequences for national integration. The first fact of irresponsibility of course is the kind of contradiction involved in the earlier observation about the impossibility of determining the extent of discrimination, the second is the fact that it is precisely this community, the Muslim, that was engaged in making these allegations and putting forward the proposal for communalization of Government jobs and had been doing so on a country-wide basis and with the agitational technique. The third is that it can serve as a cloak to conceal, or as a valid ground to justify, the known flight of trained Engineers of Aligarh Muslim University to Pakistan as well of some of the foreign-trained Muslim scholars of the Hyderabad foundation!

In another part of this work readers will find a very brief account of a proposal for holding a convention of Muslims in India sponsored, about the time when the recommendations of the National Integration Committee had begun to trickle out, by Maulana Hifzur Rehman. The learned editor of *The Times of India*, forgetful or innocent of the probable incentives provided in this behalf by his own assertions and affirmations made in the abovementioned leading article might have provided, penned a stinging leader, second of the day, on 22 May 1961. I have quoted in the context of the above events relevant portions of the contribution. However, to substantiate my contention of the irresponsible nature of the remarks contained in the leading article of 18 May issue of the paper, I shall repeat the portion which is relevant in this context. Said the learned editor:

It is entirely possible that members of the Muslim League will also attend the convention though, of course, in their individual capacity. *The allegation that the Muslims in this country are getting a rotten deal will almost certainly be the convention's refrain.* [And I say why not, if the learned editor in his cool room sedately pondering over could sign away a blank cheque for such transcription on it!] *The whole idea seems to be to form a massive pressure group to put forward the interests of the Muslim community irrespective of consequences* [to whom, the editor forgot to mention!].

My comments have to be restricted to the consideration of the feasibility

of integration and to the kind of technique and process of integration commensurate with the situation of conflict and tension centring round the Muslim group. And I wish to emphasize the fact that while 9 Muslims as members of an All-India Committee of 16 members, comprising all the four main religious communities of India, were signing or had signed a unanimous report which negatived the communal contentions in the main and recommended a reasonable attitude towards non-discrimination and offering of opportunities, other and more vociferous as well as communally more important Muslim personages had begun to use pressure-group tactics in anticipation of the lukewarm support provisioned in the report of the National Integration Committee! The convention, as will be known from the chapter referred to above, was duly held at Delhi in June 1961 and a pamphlet giving the text of the resolutions passed at it, perhaps as many as 600 Muslims—Muslim Leaguers, independents or Congressites—attending, was immediately issued. As I have summarized the resolutions elsewhere I shall content myself here with the remark that Dr Syed Mahmud, Maulana Hifzur Rahman and other prominent Muslims attending had duly taken their cue from the earlier of the editorials of *The Times of India*, which I have characterized above.

The report of the National Integration Committee, intriguingly enough was released<sup>27</sup> on 23 May 1961, i.e., immediately after the cajolery of the Congress High Command had failed to intimidate or persuade Maulana Hifzur Rahman to drop the idea of holding the proposed Muslim convention.

Of the many recommendations contained in the report, I shall quote here the one which bears on what I consider to be the central and pivotal point for all integration and integrative technique. And that concerns the educational field. The Committee's recommendation also including "social field" in it appears to me to go too far. For association for social activity and socialized living must be free and is solemnly pronounced by the Constitution to be so. The recommendation reads:

With a view to discourage the tendency to form or establish institutions, specially in the educational and social fields, in the name of caste or community it is necessary that Government and public bodies cease to extend any help, grant or assistance to the new ones. In the case of the old ones, such help, grant or assistance should be made conditional upon their being laid open to all members of the public.

This recommendation is almost a truism and a repetition of actuality. The simple reason why it is so is that the Constitution of India contains two Articles which cover the recommendation made by the Committee. Both of these Articles 29 and 30 have been quoted in full already and their

<sup>27</sup> *The Times of India*, 24-5-61.

implications brought out. Suffice it to mention here that, as the Constitution stands, neither Government nor public bodies, in so far as they are semi-Government, can refuse appropriate help to educational institutions started or maintained by any minority, whatever its name, provided admission to it is not barred to members of other groups in the nation, including of course the Hindus. As a matter of fact as I shall point out later this Article with its very broad wording is a positive hindrance in the way of the most effective and appropriate way of national integration!

The report of the National Integration Committee was taken for consideration by the All India Congress Committee on 28 May and was adopted. On 31 May Pandit Nehru presiding over a conference of Chief Ministers and other ministers from States convened by him in New Delhi to consider "the question of national integration" placed the report of the Committee before it, as it was "fully considered" by the Congress Working Committee and had been "endorsed with some minor changes".<sup>28</sup> On 1 June 1961, a Press communique was issued which forms Annexure II of *National Integration*.

Economic grievances and job-claim were the most important items on which a decision was taken at the conference. The decision being that of the Chief Ministers of States has the tone of finality. What was agreed on this matter, therefore, has to be seriously considered in our discussion of integration or national solidarity. The particular passage reads: "It was also agreed that *economic backwardness rather than community or caste would provide a more appropriate criterion for giving aid to individuals in matters of education including professional and technical training*"\* The Chief ministers agreed that "though no rigid proportions could be fixed for religious or linguistic minorities for representation in the services, steps should be taken to expand opportunities for employment of the minorities generally."

Even before the report of the National Integration Committee was released, in pursuance of the recommendations of the State Education Ministers' Conference held at New Delhi on 4 and 5 November 1960, the Government of India, by a Resolution in the Ministry of Education dated 15 May 1961, had appointed a committee of ten. The terms of reference of the Committee, which came to be known and has since been mentioned as the Committee on Emotional Integration, were laid down as: (1) "To study the role of education in strengthening and promoting the processes of emotional integration in national life and to examine the operation of tendencies which come in the way of their development", and (2) "In the light of such study, to advise on the positive educational programmes for youth in general and the students in schools and colleges in particular to strengthen in them the processes of emotional integration." The inaugural meeting of the

<sup>28</sup> *National Integration* (May-June 1961).

\* Italics mine.

committee took place on 10 July 1961. By a letter of 25 November 1961, published in the *Gazette of India* under the signature of the Joint Educational Adviser, two "additional members" were appointed to the committee, which is called therein the Emotional Integration Committee.<sup>29</sup> The committee's report was published late in 1962 and will be dealt with in the proper chronological context.

One month after the Emotional Integration Committee was inaugurated by the Union Education Minister, Dr K. L. Shrimali, for 3 days, 10-12 August 1961, the Chief Ministers of the States and Cabinet Ministers and "some other Ministers of the Central Government and from the States" participated in a meeting, convened evidently by the Prime Minister, "to consider the question of national integration". The most important of the decisions arrived at in the prolonged deliberations may be listed so as to facilitate our task of evaluating integrative technique and of determining what was or who were being attempted to be integrated and what was meant by integration as conceived by the Union Government and its committees or conferences.

As to the last item it is fortunate that the Prime Minister spelled out his ideas. I have already quoted a passage from his speech made 6 years earlier stressing that "an emotional integration of the Indian people" was meant to be deeper than "political integration" which "had already taken place to some extent", and was to be such that "*we might be welded into one, and made into one strong national unit, maintaining at the same time all our wonderful diversity*"<sup>30</sup> In his opening address to this gathering he referred to "the various aspects of national integration—cultural, educational, linguistic and administrative". Speaking on the 14th anniversary of the Independence Day from the rampart of the Red Fort in Delhi Pandit Nehru elaborated his idea thus: "When a new sun is rising in India, it behoves all of us to remain on the right-path, forge unity, defend freedom and *work for the prosperity of the nation*" He pointed out that they had to build Indian society and not a Hindu society, nor a Muslim society, nor a Sikh society. He further exhorted "We have to develop the unity of the minds and hearts of people and achieve emotional integration."

(1) The meeting agreed that "it should be made a penal offence for any individual or group to advocate secession of any part of the country from the Indian Union", (2) "The principle of having All-India Services in the Engineering, Medical and Forestry departments was accepted, subject to schemes being drawn up and circulated to the rule of rotation of officers in the existing All-India Services between the Centre and the States should be more rigorously followed", (3) "The meeting also accepted the desirability of having in every High Court some judges drawn from outside

<sup>29</sup> *Report of the Committee on Emotional Integration*, pp 169-72

<sup>30</sup> From the abovementioned Report *Italics mine*

the State."

The most important item considered and decided upon was, to judge by the number of detailed resolutions, quite clearly that of linguistic minorities and their rights guaranteed under Articles 29, 30, 350A and 350B. The authoritative Memorandum on the subject, which the Union Government, "after consultation with the Chief Ministers of the States", had issued in 1956 was discussed. The agreed formula was modified. I have dealt with the languages aspect of it and of other decisions of this meeting bearing on the aspect of the rights of linguistic minorities regarding language whether mother-tongue, State language or official language of the Union, in the chapter on Linguistic Tensions.

The next day after the termination of the meeting of Chief Ministers and others, at which the abovementioned decisions along with other were taken as conducive to integration or as the sum and substance of the integrative technique envisaged by the Government as a whole, i.e., on 13 August 1961, as reported in *The Times of India* (14-8-'61) "an informal meeting... of 30 prominent leaders interested in national integration" took place in Delhi. It was convened by Smt Indira Gandhi; and Pandit Nehru was present at it. It was agreed at the meeting that the question should be deliberated for its solution on a "non-party and non-partisan" basis. There were at least 9 Muslim members present at the meeting. One of them, I must emphasize, was Maulana Hifzur Rahman,—the gentleman who, in spite of and in defiance of Congress and even informal intervention by the Union Government, had organized a Muslim Conference only in June of that year and that too at Delhi—whose almost fire-eating resolutions I have briefly mentioned in another and proper context. At least 5 of the Muslim members were members of the National Integration Committee whose report I have dealt with above. In spite of such a solid-looking, gratified or at least pacified contingent of Muslims at the informal meeting, Dr Z. A. Ahmed, a communist, is reported as having "emphasized that steps should be taken to counteract the widespread feeling among the Muslims that they did not get adequate opportunities either in education or employment".

The only other speaker or contributor reported as having said something specific during the "six-hour discussion over two sittings" is Dr H. N. Kunzru. And he maintained that "no proof could be adduced by anyone to support such allegations". Yet "the meeting came to the conclusion that there were some grievances about which people talked in general but vague terms".

This din of national, emotional and/or administrative integration excited a correspondent of *The Times of India* to contribute three special articles entitled 'National Disintegration?' in 21, 25, and 28 August issues of the paper. Though the approach and thought content of these articles are rather complacent and sloppy, they converge on the single truth of



the rather contradictory policies of the men in power and serve to uphold my description of the activity in the pursuit of the so-called national integration as plethoric or hectic.

Exactly a month thereafter came the announcement of "the three-day national integration conference", for which there were to be 153 invitee-participants, and which was to be opened by the then Vice-President, Dr Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, on 28 November at New Delhi (*Times of India*, 27-9-61).

Opening the conference of 130 participants<sup>31</sup> Dr Radhakrishnan quoted from one of the religious rock edicts of Asoka the statement "Samavaya eva sadhuh", "concord alone is meritorious" [?].

The actual work of the conference is described thus:

1) "After a general discussion, the Conference considered the report of the National Integration Committee and, more especially, the decisions of the meetings of the Chief Ministers held on May 31, June 1, and August 10, 11 and 12, 1961. These as well as the recommendations of the Seminar on National Integration organised by the University Grants Commission in 1958 (?), were considered and discussed at length. Certain economic aspects of integration were also considered and a code of conduct for political parties was discussed. There was broad agreement with the proposals put forward by the Steering Committee in regard to these matters."

2) Fissiparous and disruptive tendencies such as "communalism, casteism, regionalism and linguism", which "tend to disrupt the solidarity of the people" must be "controlled and countered".

3) "Certain fears and apprehensions of some minority groups and the need for taking steps to remove all legitimate grievances" was taken note of.

4) The economic aspects of integration were stressed in the importance attached by the Conference to "regional balance in economic development" and in the recommendation that "a rapid development of the economically backward States and backward regions in any State" should be given priority in all plans.

We may pass over all these as a full report on the background literature, the actual discussion and a factual narration supporting either the

<sup>31</sup> *Statement, National Integration Conference* (September-October 1961), p. 3. This is the text in some versions of the famous Twelfth Rock-Edict. The Shahbrazgarhi version has "samyama" which means restraint in speech or "control over expression". D. C. Sircar makes even the other text, "samavaya", mean the same thing, i.e., "restrained speech" equating it with "samavada", (*Select Inscriptions*, pp. 34-5). "Vachogupti" (vaksamyama), i.e. restraint in speech, occurs in the fourth line of the Edict and justifies Sircar's interpretation.

statements, affirmations or the proposals is not available. There are a number of concrete proposals, either not met with in the other brochure or expansions of those, which are concerned with linguistic tensions and are already dealt with in their proper context. I shall consider here only the other concrete proposals in order that the full intent and content of integration, and its technique may be brought out, and all the endeavour so far undertaken in that behalf may be evaluated, making the path clear for any further or newer programme.

First of all, I feel happy to find that in the deliberations of this conference we come upon an exposition of the concept of "national integration" in terms more familiar and common as well as easily understood by most. Herein is defined or described "national integration" as "a psychological and educational process [readers of this book will note that in the theoretical literature on 'integration' whether by Sociologists or Political Scientists, 'integration is both a process and a condition or state']—involving the development of a feeling of unity, solidarity and cohesion, in the hearts of the people, a sense of common citizenship [destiny] and a feeling of loyalty to the nation". Of the three items cohesion is the most elemental; for as John Downing<sup>22</sup> maintains "cohesiveness" is "the operationally defined equivalent of McDougall's instinct of gregariousness—the cement which binds all human groups together." I have left it out, therefore, as the natural basis on which the superstructure of national solidarity can be and has to be built.

Before listing some of the important decisions, including the one creating a permanent (?) National Integration Council of a specified composition, I shall make some remarks from the scanty available data about the composition of the conference and its deliberations, as I think that all such information is relevant to a rational attitude towards integration. The actual number of invitees to the conference, as listed in the brochure issued immediately after the Conference, was 158. Out of these there were 18 Muslim invitees. Sixteen of the Muslims actually attended the conference. One of them was Maulana Hifzur Rahman who as we know was almost throwing down a challenge. Another was Dr [Professor?] Syed Abdul Latif, the Professor of Osmania University who came into the limelight in the decade 1937 to 1947 with his ingenious plan for staving off partition of British India, which I have dealt with at length in the chapter "Muslim Frustration" (?). A third was Dr Syed Mahmud, the veteran Congressman whose communally organizing activities evoked a leading article from the editor of *The Times of India* three or four months later (*Times of India*, 13-1-'62). But none of the 16 Muslims present at the conference figured in the actual deliberations, though besides Pandit Nehru as many as 19 participants are reported to have spoken and had their con-

<sup>22</sup> *Human Relations*, 1958, p. 157.

tributions briefly recorded on the first day of the conference (*Times of India*, 30-9-'61) and six others on the next (*Times of India*, 1-10-'61). Only Mr Frank Anthony and two and three others of these 25 speakers were non-Hindus.

The news report of 29 September (*Times of India*, 30-9-'61) recorded among the suggestions made on the second day of the National Integration Conference one for "the appointment of a minorities commission". It is an indication of the absence of calm and clear thinking about what is needed to be integrated and what integration as a process involves, that in all this din and worry about integration, and in spite of the occasional but vociferous clamours of minorities like Muslims and equally vociferous condemnation of their alleged behaviour towards the national flag or their alleged inclination towards Pakistan and its flag, that nobody, till the end of September 1961, appears to have ventured to ask the Muslims as to what they were doing to make integration a success, to turn the talk about it into an actuality, into the state of being integrated into the total Indian community. It is refreshing and in the later and present context painful, to come across a straight talk to "minorities" which the late Lal Bahadur Shastri, as Union Home Minister, addressed in Bombay on the occasion of a reception luncheon given to him by the International Club of India and which was reported in the *Times of India* on 9 October 1961.

The report reads in its relevant portion:

Regretting the unhappy incidents which have occurred in Uttar Pradesh [the communal riots triggered off by Aligarh communalism], Mr Shastri urged that there should be no feeling of suspicion among different communities. *Minorities too had a responsibility to shoulder in creating the right type of atmosphere in the country,\** Mr Shastri asserted. *They must not do anything which would generate suspicion about them in the minds of the majority.\** If they had any grievances, there were many ways to get them redressed. *But a constant harping on "tyranny and high-handedness" would only create a wrong climate in the country,* he pointed out.

Evidently Shastri's courageous question struck a somewhat sympathetic cord in the heart of *The Times of India* editor. For 3 months later having been excited to pen a leading article on the "Deplorable" state of affairs revealed by Dr Syed Mahmud's activities, the learned editor observed *inter alia* :

Both the claim [that "the interests of Muslims would be safe only in the hands of the Congress"] and the allegation [that "the Muslims in

this country would have a hard time of it if any other party gained power"] are of course false, but till such time as this becomes obvious to the vast majority of Muslims their emotional integration with the rest of the population will not be possible. (*Times of India*, 13-1-'62).

With this preface I list below some of the important decisions of the Conference:

A) "The Conference was of opinion that in order to promote better understanding and mutual goodwill and a sense of [national] solidarity, Universities and Colleges in all states should encourage deserving students from other States to study in them. For this purpose special facilities in regard to admission and scholarships may be provided".

B) "The Conference strongly urged that in all schools in India, the day's work should begin with the community singing of the National Anthem."

C) "The Conference was of opinion that in order to foster and develop national integration, it was necessary to have a code of conduct in respect of political parties, the press, students and the general public."

D) The Conference laid down the composition of the National Integration Council proposed to be established as follows: "(a) Prime Minister (Chairman); (b) The Union Home Minister; (c) Chief Ministers of all States; (d) Seven leaders of political parties represented in Parliament; (e) Smt Indira Gandhi in the capacity of the Chairman of the National Integration Council; (f) Chairman, University Grants Commission; (g) Two Educationists; (h) Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities; (i) Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes; (j) Seven persons nominated by the Prime Minister".

E) The Council "should take steps to evolve codes of conduct for the general public, students and the press, and also the code of conduct to be observed during the forthcoming elections. The Council should give early consideration to the setting up of a machinery for the examination and redress of grievances of minorities. The question of fasts for political and other purposes should also be considered by the Council."

The National Integration Council was duly formed in September 1961; but its first meeting took place at Delhi on 2 and 3 June 1962 (*Times of India*, 25-5-'62). At this meeting a statement was circulated which showed that "detailed programmes [?] for promoting emotional integration and national unity [?] have been worked out by the various media organisations of Government in the light of the recommendations made by the National Integration Conference [?]". One of the items in the statement is so curious, not envisaged by the decisions and recommendations of the National Integration Conference, that its implementation as a behest of

that august body raises an air of haze and suspicion about this document which is evidently not available in print. It is also very important from the viewpoint of national integration. It reads : as reported in *The Times of India* (3-6-62):

Instruction through the mother-tongue of linguistic minorities at the secondary stage of education: Steps have been taken [?] to implement the recommendation in all but four or five States. The matter is being pursued further with the defaulting [?] States.

The 9th paragraph of the National Integration Conference report which bears on the topic reads:

In the case of secondary education, the Conference agreed with the Chief Ministers that *the mother-tongue formula could not be fully applied for use as the medium of instruction in the secondary stage of education. It is expected that instruction will be generally given in the regional language or, where certain circumstances prevail, in any other language mentioned in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution, or in English.*\* •

It is seen that the conference did not pass any resolution about Secondary Education of the nature that the Government Statement circulated to the Council assures the Council-meeting as having been implemented by most States. The question was left quite unsettled, and the languages to be used under favourable circumstances were limited only to those of the Eighth Schedule. The Seventh Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities even so late as in mid-1965 belies the Government statement made in mid-1962. It is clear that somewhere the Government machinery connected with National Integration had gone wrong.

October 1962 brought the Chinese invasion of India and revealed the unity of the country, or so at least the leaders, even in the face of the utter rout of the army and of the loss of a large portion of the country to the enemy, gleefully proclaimed. The C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar Committee on National Integration and Regionalism, appointed by the National Integration Council was reported (*Times of India*, 11-11-'62) in November to have said that "with regional acerbities having been overtaken by the spontaneous upsurge of national solidarity in the wake of the Chinese aggression, it is not called upon to make any pronouncement". The statement of the then Home Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, made some three months later, after the Chinese aggression had satiated itself and had gone to roost, is however more guarded. Shastri is recorded<sup>13</sup> to have said that "*though the*

\* Italics mine.

<sup>13</sup> *Times of India*, 22-2-'63. Italics mine.

position regarding national integration had considerably improved during the emergency, he could not of course say that the problem is solved for ever". He was confronted with the reported statement ostensibly of C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, the Chairman of the Committee on National Integration and Regionalism, that "since integration had already been brought about by the Chinese aggression, there was no need to proceed with the work of the committee". Shastri stating that he had not seen the report of the Chairman's statement admitted that "it was a fact that the position had considerably improved during the emergency". Apparently, Shastri added the further information that of the 3 committees appointed by the National Integration Council one had not submitted its report till then and the other two "had adjourned *sine die*".

Whatever the actual statement of the Chairman of one of the 3 Committees of the National Integration Council or of Lal Bahadur Shastri, it is a fact that the National Integration Council itself ceased to show any sign of life after its first meeting in February 1962 and the Chinese invasion of October 1962!

The Home Ministry of the Union Government was satisfied that the endeavour of national integration may take a holiday. But the group in respect of whom, frankly speaking, this great endeavour has to be pursued with determination, persistence, and perseverance, would not allow the Union Government long rest. It appears that the countering forces of reaction in the majority sections in U.P., too, had begun to wake up the U.P. Government even earlier.

At this stage a brief resume of what was happening in the Tamil region of the country about the anti-Hindi attitude and agitation is necessary. I can present only the briefest outline for more reasons than one, the chief being that the Party, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) which propounded the secessionist view renounced it much before it came into full power as the Government of Madras and as the third largest single party in the Loka Sabha at the Centre.

My file does not provide any data before 1953 and thereafter, too, it furnishes only infrequent cuttings; but I think they are quite sufficient to present a broad picture of the situation and its handling by the leaders, both the local Madras ones and the Central Union high command, during a fairly long period of twelve years.

In 1953 July (*Times of India*, 15-7-'53) we learn from a news item from Tiruchirappally that Dravidian Progressive Federation, or Dravida Kazhagam, had decided on "a novel way of protesting against the reported remark of the Prime Minister describing the Tamil Nad agitation as nothing but fantastic nonsense". The Federation directed its members to travel on trains from all stations in South India without tickets and pull the inter-communication cords, to offer no resistance to their arrest, and not to pay any fine, if laid on them by Magistrates. The immediate cause of

their novel and anti-social move appears to have been the decision of the Government to name a place, till then known as Kallukudi, as Dalmiapuram, the agitators wanting to retain the old fully Dravidian name and avoid the "hated" North Indian "Dalmia". Accordingly the members of the organization got to work and a number of trains were held up. Several of them actually laid themselves flat on the railway track. Police had to open fire near Tuticorin and Dalmiapuram, killing 9 and injuring 30 persons. In Madras City alone 182 persons were arrested (*Times of India*, 16-7-'53). The volunteers of the Federation led the Black Shirts with their 77-year old leader E. V. R. Naicker and defaced some sign boards in Devanagari at railway stations, in spite of opposing volunteers lying across to prevent their getting to them, a few days after (*Times of India*, 2 and 3-8-'53).

In August Mr C. N. Annadurai and four other members of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, were tried on charges that they were members of the meeting of a committee which resolved "to do or to cause to be done certain offences as picketing the residence of the Chief Minister, starting Satyagraha in Dalmiapuram and to support an agitation to stop trains in Tamil Nad on July 15". They were sentenced to suffer imprisonment till the rising of the Court and pay a fine of Rs. 500 or in default to suffer simple imprisonment for three months. The accused were placed in class III (*Times of India*, 2-9-'53)!

Further, particularly disquieting and ominous news is recorded in my file only more than 18 months after the above occurrences. The agitation for Tamil as the language of instruction at all stages and as the language of communication in the State suddenly acquired "forceful ally" in the heads of the Kunrakudi Math, a religious institution, who threw a bomb-shell by declaring that for worship of idols Tamil formulae should supersede the "unintelligible Sanskrit rigmarole." But the ally appears to have raised a storm among the officiants of the various temples who protested and quoted authorities for sticking to their Sanskrit formulae, pointing out *inter alia* that no Tamil formulae existed. They stated that: "The Hindu religion has been a unifying factor. Many of the great South Indian temples have, by tradition and history, acquired national importance. They have become centres of pilgrimage by devotees not only from the whole of India but also from abroad." They also decided in a body "to formulate and publicise uniform rules to govern the modes of daily worship in South Indian Temples" (*Times of India*, 15-5-'55).

The Dravida Kazhagam and the "We Tamils" movement is recorded as engaged in a very novel campaign of burning the map of India (*Bharat*), in June 1960 (*Times of India*, 10-6-'60) evidently to destroy the connection of Tamil region with the rest of India. In the Triplicane area of Madras City as many as 56 persons were sentenced to pay a fine of Rs. 20 and in default to suffer 15 days' simple imprisonment.

The year 1961, which we have found to have been rather riotous and memorable for Aligarh turmoils also made itself notorious in the Southern context by the active participation of Mr C. Rajagopalachari, the first Indian Governor-General of India and a veteran of the first rank among Congressmen, in the Hindi controversy with a rather vicious pronouncement drawing a parallel between the imposition of Sinhalese on the Tamils in Ceylon and the Union efforts of popularizing Hindi in South India (*Times of India*, 17-5-61; "Current Topics"). Later in the year, towards its close came the election; and the election manifesto of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam included *the demand for the formation of Dravidanad, comprising Madras, Mysore, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh* [the Southern zone with its Zonal Council already formed by the Congress leadership and sanctioned for educational and other purposes by the Union Government and functioning as such] with the right to secede from the Indian Union. It also contained the assurance to its supporters that the organization or the Party will "strive to keep the English language permanently in India [?]\*. Three other rather important items in the manifesto were: (1) "The Government should obtain foreign loans only when they were absolutely necessary and use the money judiciously;" (2) "The present educational policy of the Madras Government" would be changed and "another university" would be established in "Tamilnad"; and (3) The Party "stood for elections based on proportional representation with the right given to the voters to recall their representatives" (*Times of India*, 18-12-61).

Towards the end of March 1962 the situation as recorded in the news was that Kamraj, the then Chief Minister of Madras and later the President of the Congress, declared "Dravidanadu" the dream of the DMK as an impossibility and said that "it was tragic that when people who had voted for DMK were now realizing their mistake after hearing the claim of the DMK leaders that they had voted for their separatist ideology", leaders of some opposition parties were telling them that they had not committed any mistake. These leaders, by misleading the people, were causing injury to the interests of the nation itself" (*Times of India*, 26-3-62).

In May of the year in the Rajya Sabha, the upper house of Parliament, A. D. Mani suggested that "calling or working for the separation of any part of the country should be regarded by law as treason". A. B. Vajapeyee supported the suggestion. Mr Akbar Ali Khan from Andhra Pradesh and Mr R. R. Diwakar from Mysore contended that Mr Annadurai, the leader of the DMK could not speak on behalf of their States, even if he could do so for Madras (*Times of India*, 3-5-62). The next day *The Times of India* reported the Prime Minister Pandit Nehru as having said "that the idea of

\* Italics mine.



secession of the south from the Union of India was so baseless that he could not take it seriously". He was further represented as having stated that "the cry of Dravidistan" voiced by Mr C. N. Annadurai in the Rajya Sabha "was not to be found at all in other states of the south like Andhra, Mysore and Kerala. It was solely confined to some people in Madras." Later in the month Mr Subramaniam, the then Minister for Heavy Industries in the Union Government, called upon the people of Tamil Nad to repudiate the DMK's demand for a separate Dravida Nadu. He particularly regretted the timing of Mr Annadurai for his demand for a plebiscite on the Dravida Nadu issue when Pakistan had put forward its demand for a plebiscite in Kashmir (*Times of India*, 21-5-'62).

Almost two months after Subramaniam's healthy advice to the people of Madras, we read of a heavy clash between "hordes" of DMK "agitators" and the Special Armed Police in different parts of Madras State. The police were reported to have "rounded up more than 5000 people, fired a number of tear gas shells and made lathi-charges on unruly demonstrators". At least 50 people were reported as injured in what are described as "the day long skirmishes between slogan shouting volunteers and the police". Among those taken into custody were Messrs. C Annadurai, the Rajya Sabha member who was also the leader of the Opposition in the Madras Assembly, Mr V. R. Nedunchezian and G. Kuchelar, the Mayor of Madras. Mr N. Manmohan, the leader of the DMK in the Loka Sabha, directed the campaign in Coimbatore but was not arrested (*Times of India*, 20-7-'62).

The Chinese invasion of India in October 1962, which with its rather favourable reaction in the matter of country's unity had put a stop to the activities of the National Integration Council, brought about a change in the views of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam. A note in the Current Topics columns of 20 October issue of *The Times of India* sounded a warning to the DMK that unless it forthwith and permanently gave up its demand for the right to secede its bona fides in regard to its proclaimed eagerness to play its part in meeting the national emergency will not be taken seriously by the country. The note ended with the following pertinent observation, revealing a significant fact regarding the DMK attitudes :

But it is indicative of the party's narrow and irrational political attitudes that for the past four years no member of the DMK has *participated in the A.I.R.'s talks programme, demanding that the term "Akashvani", should be substituted by the Tamil word "Vanoli".\**

On 30 January 1963, i.e., after the Chinese had halted their offensive, *The Times of India* carried a special article by Mr Nandan Kagal. It

\* Italics mine.

begins with a comment on the Sixteenth Amendment Bill which by then was referred to a joint select committee of the two Houses of Parliament. The amendment was to be in Article 19 to enable the State "to impose reasonable restrictions on fundamental rights in the interests of the 'sovereignty and integrity of India'". In April Annadurai declared that the Official Languages Bill had caused "the greatest disappointment and distress" in all non-Hindi speaking States and that he would not be surprised if opposition to the Bill in the non-Hindi areas took the form of a big agitation (*Times of India*, 16 and 23-4-'63). In the Rajya Sabha on 2 May, Annadurai announced that if the Official Languages Bill were not withdrawn *his party would "unfold a relentless agitation, whatever the consequences" stating inter alia that "the entire South will revolt" against the imposition of Hindi* (*Times of India*, 3-5-'61). (Italics mine). June brought the news of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam having decided to launch a State-wide (Madras) "constitutional, legal and agitational movement against the Official Languages Act and the 16th Constitution Amendment Act which banned secessionist propaganda (*Times of India*, 11-6-'63).

News from Madras as of 13 October 1963 appraised us that the DMK had finalized its plans for "a sustained constitutional agitation" against Hindi and that as a "prelude" to it had taken out "a huge procession" there with Mr C. N. Annadurai leading it. Six main items of the agitational technique were declared and they are: (1) the burning of the copies of the Article of the Constitution relating to the Official Language, (2) stopping of trains; (3) travelling in trains without ticket; (4) picketing Government offices where arrangements for teaching Hindi are made; (5) holding of black-flag demonstrations against Central and State Ministers, and (6) tarring Hindi sign boards wherever they are found. Annadurai further announced 17 November as the day for the starting of the struggle (*Times of India*, 14-10-'63). A week later, it appears, Mr Annadurai declared that the agitation would continue even beyond 1965. It is noteworthy that at the meeting in Madurai on 20 October wherein Annadurai made the announcement, a member of the Muslim League too addressed the gathering (*Times of India*, 21-10-'61).

A refreshingly welcome change in the overcharged atmosphere, a tactical move no doubt, was borne by the Madras news of 3 November, i.e., just a fortnight before the actual campaign was to start. We read on 4 November the partially reassuring news that the central executive of the DMK had only the previous day amended its constitution dropping out its most obnoxious goal of "independent Dravida Nad". The general council of the Kazhagam was to meet in December to ratify the amendment. With Mr V. R. Nedunchezian in the chair the executive committee resolved to replace the independence objective by a more restricted one, though quite clearly beyond the legal competence of not only the committee or the

Kazhagam but also of the whole Tamil population, that of striving for the formation of a closer Dravida union of the four Southern linguistic States "with as large powers as possible within the framework of the sovereignty and integrity of the Indian Constitution" (*Times of India*, 4-11-'63).

The change being welcome in itself has to be applauded no doubt. But it must be pointed out, as already suggested by the expression "a tactical move", that the Anti-Seccessionist Law had already become part of the Indian Statute Book!

The events of the third week of November, characterized by prompt and appropriate action of the Madras Government, forced the DMK leadership to declare, a day before the contemplated start of the campaign, that "the proposed burning of the language chapter of the Indian Constitution on the beach" next day had been cancelled, Mr C. N. Annadurai and four other leaders having been already arrested. Nearly 250 other DMK members had been arrested too. By 22 November more than 500 DMK leaders were under arrest (*Times of India*, 15, 16, 17, 22-11-'63).

On 18 November (*Times of India*, 19-11-'63) Mr M. Bhaktavatsalam, the new Chief Minister of Madras, in reply to the question by Mr Mukkaiya Thevar (Forward Bloc) whether the Government would give up the national and emotional integration scheme in view of DMK giving up the Dravida Nadu demand, stated that it would not give up the plans. He dilated on the steps taken by the Government, which, in view of the importance of what the detailed statement implies, deserves to be quoted in full. He said:

.... provision has also been made for the linguistic minorities to study through their mother-tongue and also to learn the regional language. [A perusal of paras 91 to 95 of the *Seventh Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities* will disburden any impartial reader of the implication that the statement registered a real gain.] Under the integration scheme all schools were instructed to start their day's work with community singing of the national anthem... Text books\* were being redesigned so as to inculcate in the minds of pupils an integrated outlook [?] and a sense of unity of India as well as of the basic cultural background of the country.

\* Apropos of the reference to text books and their redesigning I have to inform the reader that Mr K. Balasubramania Iyer, MLC, Madras, had stated before the Regionalism Committee of the National Integration Council more than a year before that a chapter in a Tamil text book was devoted to an attack on the idea of oneness of the country. The newspaper report of Mr Iyer's evidence further adds the highly intriguing information that the then Chief Minister of Madras and later the Congress President, Mr K. Kamraj, as a member of the Regional Committee "noted down the caption of the book Regional Committee which has been prescribed for the eighth standard and also took a copy of the book with him." (*Times of India*, 3-9-'62).

Members of the DMK, Swatantra and Forward Bloc groups staged a walk-out soon after the session had commenced, on the Speaker of the Assembly having disallowed adjournment motions over the prohibitory orders promulgated in Madras city and over the arrest of Mr C. N. Annadurai and others.

However, the movement including the demand for separate Tamil Nad was not quite dead as we hear its echoes till much later. On 27 April, 15 DMK volunteers were arrested at Pondicherry while staging an anti-Hindi demonstration (*Times of India*, 28-4-'64). On 13 June Annadurai, the chief who was in prison, was released after the expiry of his term of six months' rigorous imprisonment; and he was prompt enough to assure the pressmen that the campaign was suspended only for a month on account of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's death. He said to them:

*We are opposed to Hindi being made the sole official language of the Union. We are firmly of the view that all the 14 languages enumerated in the Constitution [It must be remembered that then the VIIIth Schedule had only 14 languages including Sanskrit; but recently Sindhi having been added to them there are now 15 languages in the VIIIth Schedule] should be made the official languages of the Union and until these languages become suitable for that role English should continue as the official language. There is no question at all of Hindi alone becoming the official language. It cannot, should not and need not be made that.*<sup>24</sup>

The General Council of the Kazhagam in July gave its approval to the earlier-mentioned change made in the party's creed and demands by the executive committee. The demand for a separate Tamil Nad, one would have thought, was thus given up (*Times of India*, 14-7-'64).

But no; after the temporary quietus to disruptive activities imposed upon by the country's having to meet the challenge of Pakistan's invasion of Kashmir and violation of Kutch boundary, things began to look up rather briskly. A Jaipur report of 12 December 1965 tells us that the previous day Mr C. N. Annadurai had declared the need for "modifying the Constitution to provide for a real and purposeful federation". What exactly he meant by it can only be guessed from his further assertion that unity did not mean uniformity and that unity amidst diversity which ought to be the aim can be achieved by "understanding one another's culture". He also stressed the need for "an exchange of students between south and north Indian States". The third utterance imputed to Mr Annadurai brings out his deeper meaning much better; and it is that the problem facing the country after a decade would be the creation of "a federal feeling and

<sup>24</sup> *Times of India*, 15-6-64. Italics mine.

not a feeling of integration" \* (*Times of India*, 13-12-'65).

Students of Madras had joined the fray of agitation against Hindi with the formation of the Tamilnad Students anti-Hindi Agitation; and no less a political leader than the octogenarian Bharata Ratna Chakravarti Rajagopalachari addressing it backed them in their campaign. In view of the turmoil that had accompanied and followed the proposal and passing of the Official Languages Bill in 1965, the editor of the *Times of India* penned a leading article goaded, evidently, by Rajagopalachari's activity (*Times of India*, 5-3-'66).

In the beginning of January 1967 the election manifesto released by Mr C. N. Annadurai on behalf of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam contained the following objectives of the party:

1. establishing closer contacts with the three Southern States of Andhra, Mysore and Kerala,
2. forming a Dravida Nad within the Indian Union and preserving the culture of the South, i.e., of the four States whose cultural affinity "marked them out from the North" and
3. securing a better allocation of powers between the Union and the State, giving the latter more powers than at present.

Turning to the story of integrational endeavour I have to begin with the press report from Lucknow of 30 March 1964, which states that the U.P. Vidhan Sabha (Upper House) held a secret session "to discuss the activities of fifth columnists and communalists in the State. Neither visitors nor newsmen were allowed to listen to the debate." (*Times of India* 31-3-'64). About 6 weeks later, in May 1964, the All-India Congress Committee meeting adopted "the only official resolution before the Bombay session" moved by Mr Morarji Desai, which reiterated the Party's and Government's "firm determination to put down communal disturbances". There had occurred communal riots in Kashmir, East Pakistan and Eastern India which evoked this resolution.

The National Integration Council then figured in the news after 2 years, *The Times of India* of 26 June 1964 reporting that the Council was being "revived to combat separatist tendencies and promote unity". The separatist tendency refers principally to DMK's threat of Madras being taken out of the Union.

Naturally all this stirred the Union Government and we read in a New Delhi despatch of 27 June that the old proposal for banning communal organizations was being mooted (*Times of India*, 28-6-'64). Within a week of this news the press report from Delhi of 4th July flashed the rather curious information that the report of Jain Committee, which was appointed evidently by the Congress Parliamentary Party in 1960, and had submitted its report in 1961, was released on the day by the Secretary of that

Party. The committee had "unanimously recommended that communal parties should be totally banned and all their activities declared unlawful". The following observation in the press despatch is of particular interest in the context of our study:

Expressing concern at the communal trends in the country, the report says that, in certain parts of the country the Muslim League, which had become defunct after independence, is again raising its head and fighting elections. . . . Communalism must be suppressed whenever it tries to raise its head (*Times of India*, 6-7-'64).

In July by 20th we discover the Home Ministry of the Union Government in a mood favourable to "the convening of the council of the National Integration Conference and its committees as a prelude to the reactivation of the national integration movement". A paper on the question drafted by the Ministry was evidently supplied to the press. The gains of the one year campaign, which was cut short by the Chinese invasion, were enumerated in it. Three of them are concrete and may be listed here:

1. Constitutional amendment "accorded English the status of an associate official language along with Hindi" [Official Languages Act of 1963];
2. banning "the preaching of secession of any part from the Union of India";
3. securing "legislative sanction for the constitution of three new all-India services, namely, the engineering, health and forest services" (*Times of India*, 21-7-64).

In spite of the Jain Committee's confidence and bold assurances regarding the legality of the proposed ban, the Union Government and its Law Ministry had qualms and we read in *The Times of India* of 16 September that the Deputy Minister for Law had told the Loka Sabha that "the Government had not been able to take a final decision on banning communal parties as the proposal bristled with legal and constitutional difficulties". The conference of the Chief Ministers of States taking place in New Delhi on 14 December 1964, "after a prolonged discussion on the problem of combating communalism felt that the existing law to penalise the promotion of hatred between communities should be made more stringent" (*Times of India*, 13-12-'64).

We may now appraise the results of the integrational endeavour of the Government. On the linguistic front, as I have made clear with the help of facts from Government publications, integration has tended to proceed towards malintegration and even disintegration. Linguistic States

will, if the trend proceeds and the linguistic policies of the States materialize, be something like the nation-states of Europe. We will witness a condition somewhat like the one which, writing 20 years ago, in Nana-vati and Vakil's symposium on *Group Prejudices*, I had declared India, during the three millenia of her political history, had escaped.

The social tensions most intimately connected with language are: (1) The one existing in the South in Madras, or in Tamil Nad to give the region its most cherished and local name and (2) the one centring round Muslims.

The first tension, existing in Tamilnad, having not been at all expressed in the deliberations of the Constituent Assembly in anything like its image today, has not been studied in full in this book. It could have formed a part of another more or less major tension-complex, named Regional Tensions, language entering into its composition only as one element, which do not form a topic of study in this book. The Tamilnad tension, however, has intruded itself into this study through its being the most pronounced form of linguistic tensions, *vis-a-vis* the problem of an official or link language, or rather of one language for the Union of India, i.e., the problem of Union Language as against State Languages. I shall, therefore, note in brief the position regarding integration in the matter of the Tamilnad agitation, which like the movement of the Nagas of the North-East, envisages, in the first instance, a State within the Union. The Nagas having gained a State and having absorbed a fair amount of the resources placed by the Union at its disposal, now want Nagaland to be an independent State, though it is not clear that they would not expect financial aid from the Indian Union for their multifarious activities.

The DMK having come to power on the strength of the programme of activity advertized in the election-manifesto has begun to act so as to implement it. Mr Annadurai's quickness of action not only in changing the inscription "Madras Government Transport" on the state-owned buses plying in the State to its Tamil equivalent "Tamizhaga Arasu Pokku-Varathu" presumably in Tamil script, but also in having the Ministers' name-boards in the Secretariat inscribed in Tamil along with English, which was previously the only inscription on it, is clear evidence that he will persistently push forward with the carrying out of his promise of baulking the progress of Hindi and pursuing the formation of the Southern block of semi-independent States.

Mr Annadurai's action in replacing the motto of India (Bharat) on the emblem viz., "Satyameva Jayate", which is a Sanskrit sentence meaning "truth alone is victorious", written in the Devanagari script, by its Tamil translation "Vaimcya Vellum"<sup>25</sup> in Tamil script demonstrates his scant respect for national symbols and their nationally evocative function. The

<sup>25</sup> *Times of India*, 15-4-67.

action establishes the DMK's hostility to both the Sanskrit language and the Devanagari script and implies further undesirable undercurrents.

The evocative power of mottos and emblems, in fact, of all symbols, lies in their identical use, in form or in utterance or in both as the case be, their power, if their forms or sounds are different, ceases to be common and fails to achieve the purpose of simultaneous self-identification with the unit or object or person to which or to whom they relate. The action of the DMK in regard to motto must, therefore, be considered to be the first blow of the devisive axe.\*

The action of the Madras Government necessitates some study of the various integrative devices of the symbological kind which are current in the country after independence.

India (*Bharat*) has three national symbols which are to present an image of the nation-community to its citizen-members and establish self-identification. There is first the national emblem—first because it is an emblem and a device noted in the official publication, *India 1966* at the beginning of the description of national symbols. In point of time it came in much later than the national flag and the national anthem. As the above-mentioned work tells us, the national emblem of four lions, is a device adopted by the Government of India on 26 January 1950. It bears the words "Satyameva Jayate" in Devanagari letters. It is a sentence in Sanskrit taken up from the *Mundaka Upanishad* and thus harkens back to a time before 600 B.C. Its meaning is characteristically moralistic and energizing. It means "Truth alone is victorious".

The second symbol, the national flag, is a pure emblem having no wording on it. It was presented to the nation by the women workers for freedom and was adopted by the Constituent Assembly on 22 July 1947. The three colours of the flag are believed to represent the two principal sections of the nation, the saffron representing the Hindus and the green the Muslims. The wheel design copied from the wheel carved on the abacus of the Sarnath Lion Capital of Asoka, from which the first symbol, the emblem without its inscription, is adopted, is to be in navy blue and stands for the Charkha, the contraption with which hand-spinning has been traditionally carried on and which formed during the national struggle for independence, at least during a quarter of a century before the arrival of independence, a symbol of unity within and of fight without. A code for ensuring "the proper use and display of the flag" exists and is expected to be adhered to by all. The position of the saffron band of the flag, next to the position *vis-a-vis* other pendants or possibility of them, is the most detailed and important element in the code. The saffron band in all positions of the National flag must occupy a position which

\* This formed one of the observations I made while inaugurating the Conference of Indian Sociologists at Bombay on October 14, 1967 in my pleading for the cultivation of a special branch of Sociology to be named Political Sociology.



makes it the first member of the whole, from which the eye must proceed down, south, west or to the right of the person facing the national flag. It is to be normally flown "on all important Government [Union as well as State] buildings such as high courts, secretariats, commissioner's offices, collectorates, jails and the office of the district boards or zila parishads and municipalities."

The third national symbol is the national anthem which was adopted, according to the authority mentioned above, on 24 January 1950. It is Ravindranath Tagore's song *Jana-gana-mana* in 5 stanzas, only the first of which "has been adopted by the Defence Forces and is usually sung on ceremonial occasions". It is surprising that after the National Integration Conference and Council decreed that the national anthem shall be sung in chorus in schools at the beginning of day's lessons the fact should not be stated in the official publication of the Government mentioned above! The older song "Vande Mataram" which served as the rallying call for revolutionaries in Bengal and the national freedom movement for long, composed by the Bengali novelist Bankim Chandra Chatterjee in 1882, and was sung at the 1896 session of the Indian National Congress, is also a national symbol being characterized as "national song". It is also transcribed along with its translation—the portion of course which is adopted as such—in the official publication. The eight lines of "Vande Mataram" which constitute this adopted portion, is in straightforward Sanskrit, while the song of Tagore which forms the present national anthem is in Bengali.

Two of the national symbols figure in the debates of the Constituent Assembly and evidently at some stage were adopted by that august body, though none of the national symbols finds a place in the Constitution of India.

About the national flag, the adoption of which was heralded by two of the most inspiring speeches in the debates of the Constituent Assembly, one by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the other by Dr Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan<sup>36</sup>, Seth Govind Das said:<sup>37</sup>

Perhaps you might have noticed the fact that in the Irish Constitution there is mention of their National Flag. Though we accepted by a resolution this tricolour flag as our National Flag, we have made no mention of the National Flag in the draft [of the Constitution]. We would like that our Constitution should specifically provide that a particular flag shall be our National Flag just as has been done in the Irish Constitution.

Mr B. A. Mondloi<sup>38</sup> too observed:

<sup>36</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, 4, pp. 761-67, 772-73.

<sup>37</sup> *Debates, Constituent Assembly*, 7, 1, p. 222.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 271.

There are, however, certain omissions and certain things which are not found in this Draft Constitution and proper emphasis has not been placed on these subjects. The omissions are with respect to our National Flag and National Anthem. In a Draft Constitution and in a Constitution which is going to govern our country, there should be a proper place for the National Anthem and for the National Flag. There is also a necessity with respect to a common language and a common script.

Professor Shibban Lal Saksena went much further and tabled a whole new Part to be added to the Draft Constitution, three Articles in which pertained to the three national symbols. Article 9 read:

The National Flag of Bharat shall be the tricolour of saffron, white and green of pure hand-spun and hand-woven Khadi cloth, with the Dharmachakra [the Wheel of Law] of Asoka inscribed in blue in the centre in the middle stripe, the ratio between the width and breadth being 2:1.

Article 12 read:

The National Anthem of Bharat shall be the "Vande Mataram" which is reproduced in the Second Schedule.

The subsequent Schedules of the Constitution were consequentially to be renumbered. And Article 13 read:

The Arms of Bharat consist of the three Lions above the pedestal and the Dharmachakra, as are depicted on the top of the Asoka pillar at Sarnath.

I may point out that the Yugoslav Constitution of 1946 has devoted two of its first Articles, Nos. 3 and 4, to the description of the coat of arms of the State and of the three coloured flag of the State giving its full measurements.<sup>39</sup>

About the national anthem Seth Govind Das,<sup>40</sup> putting in a plea for "Vande Mataram", pointed out that it would lend itself to orchestration. He further criticized the song "Jana gana mana" of Tagore pointing out that it "was composed on the occasion of the visit of the late Emperor George V to India in 1911. The poem offers greetings not to mother India, but to the late King Emperor. Every sentiment in it is in relation to the 'Bharat Bhagia Vidhata' and who is meant is clear from the expression 'victory to the Emperor' (Jai Rajeshwar). It is evident that in a Republic we cannot in our national anthem offer any greetings to Rajeshwar".

<sup>39</sup> Robert J. Kerner, *Yugoslavia*.

<sup>40</sup> *Debate, Constituent Assembly*, 7, 1, p. 223.

It is clear from the present national anthem that the objectionable words "Jai Rajeshwar" have been dropped out from it. But then there are defects more serious than the occurrence of the two words "Jai Rajeshwar". Leaving out its original occasion and the reference of the victory chant which, to say the least, is not addressed to the country, it has to be pointed out that its enumeration of the peoples and regions of the country, is both awkward and defective. The term Dravida in so far as it is intended to include all the Dravidian language-speakers offends by emphasizing their group identity as against other, insinuating the Aryan and the Dravidian dichotomy. In so far as neither among the rivers nor among the mountains mentioned is there any from the south of the Vindhyas it truncates very badly a country, unfortunate enough to be allowed to be split by its worthy inhabitants after a physical continuity of over four thousand years! The mention of only the two great mountain ranges, Himachala or Himalaya and the Vindhyas, presents the image of Manu's Madhyadesa. What a truncated image, one likely to create unpleasant reaction among compatriots of the South !

We noticed how Mr Annadurai has treated the inspiring inscription of the national emblem, the coat of arms in Western terminology. The emblem and its inscription appear to have no more legal standing than what an administrative act of the Union can have. It does not appear to have been adopted even through a resolution of Parliament, and there we are!

The national flag, though adopted by a resolution of the Constituent Assembly is not in the Constitution; and I wonder if it has much better legal standing than the national emblem. Anyway it has been treated by Muslim Indians in their group-activities with scant respect.

A few cuttings from the issues of the daily papers in my file will substantiate what I have said. Here is what appeared in the issue of *The Times of India* dated 1 May 1954:

The Home Minister, Mr Sampurnanand [Bharat Ratna Govind Vallabh Pant was the Chief Minister of U.P. then] declared in the State Assembly [of the U.P.] today [14th] that some Muslims organizations, still swayed by Muslim League ideologies, were spreading communalism in the country . . . Members questioned the Home Minister closely about the recent Lucknow Muslim Conference presided over by Bakshi Ghulam Mahommed, Prime Minister of Kashmir. He said that the resolutions passed there had been noted by Government. He denied that these reproduced the views of the notorious Aligarh Convention. *The national flag was flown over the pandal and the national anthem was not sung*, but that did not amount to an insult to these national emblems, he maintained. \*

\* Italics mine.

In the news from Hyderabad of 16 August 1954 reporting a riot at Nizamabad on the eve of the Independence day, which resulted in injuries to 119 persons, it is stated: "Rioting broke out when it was found that some 'miscreants' had hoisted the Pakistani national flag on Mahatma Gandhi's statue in the main bazar" (*Times of India*, 17-8-'54). On 18 August "minor disturbances broke out in Goshamahall, a suburb of Hyderabad City, following the hoisting of the Pakistani flag by some miscreants" (*Times of India*, 19-8-'53). On 29 August, "7 persons were killed and 19 injured in disturbances that broke out in Gulbarga town, following the hoisting of a Pakistani flag over a Ganesh temple, according to a press-note of the Hyderabad Government tonight" (*Times of India*, 30-8-'54). *The Times of India* (2-9-'54) in its advice from Raipur (C.P.) carried the caption "Pak Flag Fever Is Spreading" and revealed that the Pakistani flag was seen fluttering on the District Court building. On 30 September, it was reported "green flags resembling the Pakistani national flag were found hoisted on several buildings, including a temple and the Janapada Sabha office in Seoni-Malwa in Hoshangabad District on Saturday last." News report of 10 October from Dharwar revealed that at Morab, a village in Navalgund taluka on Thursday, some persons were carrying Pakistani flags in a Dasera [the Hindu warrior festival falling generally in October] procession (*Times of India*, 11-10-'54).

The news from Berhampore, Murshidabad District, of 5 August 1957 revealed that a Bhadba, about eight miles from Behrampore, one Muslim MLA of the Congress Party was arrested and let off on a personal bond following a search of his house there. In the MLA's house were recovered "some live bombs, explosive materials, *two Pakistani flags* and receipt books bearing the name of the Dacca Muslim League (Bhadba branch)" (*Times of India*, 7-8-'57. Italics mine).

The Takht-Nashini ceremony of the new Aga Khan, the spiritual leader of the Ismaili community, took place at Bombay in March 1958; but its echoes had not died down till September of the year. And that was because of the scant courtesy, nay downright disrespect, shown at the ceremony to the national flag of India.

The glowing account of the impressive ceremony spread over two columns in the *Times of India* of 12 March ended with the following:

U.P.I. adds: The Indian national flag was conspicuous by its absence from among the array of national flags displayed at the Takht-Nashini celebrations of His Highness the Aga Khan at the Vallabhbhai Stadium on Tuesday evening. Mr Akbar H. Merchant, President of the Aga Khan Takht-Nashini Celebration Committee, said the Committee was under the impression that the Indian national flag could not have been displayed on an occasion of this nature. That was the only reason for its exclusion." (*Times of India*, 12-3-'58)

An explanation of the kind was not likely to satisfy the public and there was a good deal of correspondence about it in the daily papers. The issues of 13, 15, 17, 18 and 20 March of *The Times of India* for example, carried such letters. In September the affair was discussed on the floor of the State Legislative Assembly. While replying to a number of questions by the members, Mr Y. B. Chavan, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, revealed the still more curious information that the Celebration Committee had written to him a letter before the function. The contents of that letter appear to be so staggering that one wonders that the Chief Minister allowed the function to take place without exacting an unconditional apology from the Committee. For "in that [letter] his [Mr Chavan's] permission was sought to use the Indian National flag at the time of a march-past of volunteers". Mr Chavan meekly said further: "*Since the use of the national flag at a march-past would be a disrespect to the flag, the Committee was informed that the permission to use the tricolour in the march-past could not be granted.*" (*Times of India*, 6-9-'58. *Italics mine*).

The so-called nationalist Muslim Convention held at Delhi in June 1961, as will be found from another part of this work, does not appear to have displayed the national flag. And its proceedings began with the recitation of Mohammed Iqbal's song instead of the national anthem!

The question of the national symbols is generally a delicate one, though its significance is great. The symbols are to create the image of the nation in the minds of its citizens and to evoke appropriate behaviour indicative of not only loyalty but also of love and devotion. Yet they are in the beginning and in the early stages to be forced down through a persistent and constant practice, diligently and carefully watched, offering such inducements as are evocative through competition and healthy rivalry as also through the semi-legal channels of an administrative nature. Especially is this the case with our national symbols which do not find a place in the Constitution and consequently have not the highest legal sanction behind them.

The national symbol of the flag has been the object of highest legal adjudication in the USA. Justice Frankfurter speaking for the Supreme Court of the States "in 1940 upheld a State law requiring school children to salute the flag in spite of the Constitutional guarantee of religious liberty. He said: "We live by symbols. *The flag is the symbol of our national unity, transcending all internal differences, however large, within the framework of the constitution.*" The law-making body having decided that saluting the flag was an appropriate means "to evoke the unifying sentiment without which there can ultimately be no liberties, civil or religious", he declared it would be transcending its own province for the

\* "As quoted in Quincy Wright's *A Study of War*, p. 1086, f.n. from R. E. Cushman's article "Constitution Law in 1939-40" in *American Political Science Review*, XXXV, pp. 269 ff. *Italics mine*.

Supreme Court to declare the law void as abridging religious liberty. However, in a recent New Jersey case affecting the Black Muslims' saluting the flag, it appears, the decision [not of the Supreme Court?] was that "like standing in British theatres for the national anthem", flag-saluting is "a customary but voluntary, and not a compulsory act".<sup>42</sup>

On the significance of symbols for human communities Professor A. N. Whitehead<sup>43</sup> observed forty years ago:

In fact, the symbol evokes loyalties to vaguely conceived notions, fundamental for our spiritual natures. The result is that our natures are stirred to suspend all antagonistic impulses, so that the symbol procures its required response in action. Thus the social symbolism has a double meaning. It means pragmatically the direction of individuals to specific actions; and it also means theoretically the vague ultimate reasons with their emotional accompaniments, whereby the symbols acquire their power to organize miscellaneous crowd into a smoothly running community.

The story of the national symbols is thus originally neither edifying nor hopefully reassuring in their recent history. It was, therefore, very right and proper for the National Integration Conference and Council to recommend their frequent and regular as well as occasional use in schools, though the recommendation is neither adequate nor comprehensive. Regular periodic reports of such use and competitive contests as well as periodic tests in various schools by independent committees of responsible citizens, not having been provided for and insisted upon, the progressive internalization of the national symbols and their evocative power has not been insured but left to chance and very faulty sweet wills!

While on the national symbols front we cannot be sure about any integrative advance in actual fact, on the linguistic front there is very clear evidence of a regression, which though only malintegrative in the present may, not in the distant future, prove to be disintegrative. The enthronement of the State or Regional languages when not only the establishment of the official language or the link language has not been achieved but its very existence is in the balance, is quite plainly an indication of the regionalization of the political entity having got the upper hand. In itself this situation is not merely malintegrative but potentially disintegrative.

The Official Language or the link language is no longer one but two for an indefinite period. To see things in their proper perspective and to state the naked truth as it uncovers itself there is further a clear division in the distribution of the two link-languages. As we have seen in the chapter

<sup>42</sup> George E. G. Catlin, *Political and Sociological Theory and its Applications*, 1964, p. 79.

<sup>43</sup> *Symbolism, its Meaning and Effect*, 1927, p. 73.

on Linguistic Tensions, Madras, or Tamilnad to use the expression dear to our Tamilian countrymen, and West Bengal will open-heartedly appropriate English as the link-language. On the other hand, Gujarat and Maharashtra, over and above the Hindi enthusiastic States of U.P., M.P., Bihar and Rajasthan, bid fair to embrace Hindi as their link-language.

In this connection I have to draw my reader's attention to a very strongly and definitively worded memorandum issued by 18 Bengali intellectuals led by Dr Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, including two Muslims, which after its publication in February 1965 in the *Institute of Political and Social Studies Bulletin*,\* was published in the well-known scientific journal of India, *Science and Culture* in its August issue of the same year. I quote here only short passages from that two and a half column communication to substantiate my statement. It says: "

Some day, no doubt, an agreed formula may be evolved *fixing one of our many languages as the official language of India*; but we should allow time to work it out and not force its pace. *Till then English should continue to be the language of inter-State and international communication, the official language of the Union Government and the medium of examination, in U.P.S.C. examinations...* We suggest therefore that English, and English alone must continue for the time being till an agreed formula is evolved and this agreement must be based on the consensus of the people of each State and not of the Chief Ministers of these States alone. . . The decision that English should continue for as long as an agreed formula is not evolved must be guaranteed by an amendment of the Constitution. . . Till the question of official or national language is finally settled the amount now spent from the funds of the Union Government for the propagation of Hindi should be stopped.

The last directive issued by the Bengali intellectuals goes directly against Article 351 of the current Constitution of India. The Article is a Special Directive to do exactly what the Union Government has been doing, perhaps neither as expeditiously nor as expansively or wisely as it should have done, acting under it. If the Bengali intellectuals want that the work of Hindi propagation should stop they should first get the Constitution so amended that the Special Directive of Article 351 is dropped out of the Constitution!

The progressive extension of the connotation of the expression "educational institutions" in Article 30 to include not only primary schools, secondary schools but also colleges and consequently Universities for all minorities is positively malintegrative at present, and in particular cases like

\* My inquiries to know more about this *Bulletin* and the Institute whose journal it is have failed to bear any fruit.

" *Science and Culture*, August 1965, pp. 394-95. Italics mine.

that of Muslim Indians may prove disintegrative in the near future.

In the case of the Muslims, who are both a linguistic and a religious minority, in the light of the brief history of the fight of Muslims in pre-Partition India for a special status to their mother-tongue Urdu, this extreme liberalization of Article 30 is not unlikely to act as a crystalizing agent to Urduise the whole of their University Education and thus to complete the process of separatism of Muslim Indians from other Indians. In the new set-up, which has given the world the new nation-State of Pakistan, which was prevented from making Urdu the sole official language of the State because of the opposition of the Eastern section of the State, the impetus for such a denouement must be considered to be very powerfully compelling. From the chapters on "Some Thoughts and Actions of Muslim Indians" it is clear that about 12 to 15 years ago a well-placed Muslim official had already voiced the desire, which was further made by one conference or the other of Muslim Indians, for what cannot but be called a Urdu University and for status of equality with Hindi to Urdu language. The latest and the most powerful catalytic agent has been poured through a double-barrelled gun in the *Report of the Education Commission (1964-66), Education and National Development*.

It is not unreasonable to describe the linguistic policy of this commission as guided by two principal considerations: (1) that of dethroning Sanskrit and (2) that of enthroning Urdu and raising it to the position of equality with Hindi. The commission—I don't think it took its cue in this respect from the memorandum of the Bengali intellectuals, mentioned above, substituting Sanskrit where the latter have put Hindi—has asked not only the Union Government but the people of India, too, to stop creating Sanskrit Universities. Says "the commission: "We cannot also support the idea of Sanskrit universities. . . We suggest that no new Sanskrit university should be established." And this after the commission has asked for and provided for banishing Sanskrit from secondary education under the three-language-formula quite effectively, so that even the States of U.P. and Rajasthan, in which Sanskrit forms one of the three languages compulsorily to be studied, should not be able to continue it in their secondary education. And that is how the commission recognizes "the importance of the study of classical languages \* and of [?] the special claim that Sanskrit has on the national system of education"!

Practical illustration of the importance of Sanskrit in the national system of education is provided by the Commission towards the end of the first chapter of its Report by quoting a passage, the very first in the text of the Upanishad, being a query, after which it has received its name of *Kena*.

<sup>45</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 197, 293, 614, 649, paras 8.49 and 11.5814-5, 12, 134 (4-5).

\* I doubt if even linguists now attach much importance to the study of classical language. I have reported the adverse opinion of one well-known linguist, to that effect, in the chapter on Linguistic Tensions.



That such a body of learned persons should introduce the passage as of "thousands of years ago", apart from the question of the propriety of the noble and the transcendental implication being dragged down into the ordinary affairs of the educational world, quite clearly establishes the need for more intense and extensive study of Sanskrit as a part of the national system of education.\*

In its eagerness to shoot Sanskrit out of sight the Commission, which tenderly remembers "minorities", forgot the fact that Sanskrit is enthroned by Article 351 of the Constitution of India as an important source for enabling the regional Hindi of the VIIIth Schedule to develop into the language that "may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India"!

Lest any reader should think that the Commission also forgot the fact of Sanskrit figuring in the VIIIth Schedule along with Hindi, Urdu, and other languages of India I hasten to tell him that it has not done so. It remembers the firm establishment of Sanskrit in the VIIIth Schedule. And that is the reason why it avoids mentioning the VIIIth Schedule and uses the dangerous paraphrasis of "modern Indian language".

Having done this destructive work and cleared the deck for principal action, that of enthroning Urdu as of equal status with Hindi and enjoying a superior claim and status over other languages of the VIIIth Schedule, or in the favourite terminology of the Commission over "modern Indian languages", the Commission proceeds to detail its plan. Having advocated and supported the notion of University education being imparted through regional languages as soon as possible,<sup>46</sup> the Commission lays down a safeguard for "minorities" as if the question, which has been receiving both constitutional, and political-administrative attention for two decades, is new and fresh. It says:

To safeguard the interest of minorities, some special steps would be needed. The maintenance of colleges teaching through the medium of Hindi in the non-Hindi speaking areas or of Urdu (*which is not a regional language as the other modern Indian languages are*) in any part of the country should not only be permitted but encouraged.

With one innocuous-looking "safeguard" for minorities—the minority which is the special concern of the Commission in its languages-study-policy is only the Muslims—Urdu is placed on a footing of complete equality with Hindi, and Muslim Indians are given the charter of freedom from any study not only of any of the so-called regional languages, i.e., official languages of States, but also that of Hindi, the official language of the

\* The quotation as it figures has a solecism in "vacham" which ought to be "vacham".

<sup>46</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 13-4, 291-93. Italics mine.

Union. For the expression "in any part of the country" going with Urdu colleges as against "non-Hindi speaking areas" going with Hindi colleges means that Urdu colleges can be and have to be established even in States whose official language is Hindi. Muslims thus are completely insulated from the contagion of Hindi, except what little they might have in Urdu-schools for 3 years, and marked off as a section of Indian population distinct from other sections all over the country. This is integration in the reverse!

The Commission pushes Urdu forward by the backdoor into the position of an official language by declaring, parenthetically though, that Urdu is not a regional language like other modern Indian languages. Here the Commission sets at naught the current Constitution, in which only the languages, whether 14 before 1967 or 15 after 1967, or any number that may in future be placed there, enumerated in the VIIIth Schedule are designated as regional languages. Urdu, therefore, if it disowns itself being a regional language can have only the status of a mother-tongue as one among the 572 such languages of attested nomenclature which according to the Census of 1961 account for 43.6 crores (436 millions) of our countrymen.<sup>67</sup>

True, the three-language-formula in operation over 17 years, has spoken of regional languages instead of referring to them as official languages of States; but the Constitution is quite clear on the point. Any language "spoken by a substantial proportion of the population of a State" has the possibility of being recognized as the official language of the State under the provisions of Article 347 and the Government memorandum of 1956. What the Commission or any body can legitimately say about Urdu is that, except partially in Andhra Pradesh, Urdu is, unlike the 12 other languages of the VIIIth Schedule, not a State language or an official language of any State. But so is Sindhi.

Intense concern of the Commission regarding the many-pronged uplifting of the status of Urdu is evidenced by its further recommendation that two centres for the advanced study of Urdu should be started, of course by the Union Government, "one in the North and one in the South". And in this recommendation one can clearly see the ghost of Osmania Urdu University of the defunct Hyderabad state of the Nizam stalking abroad to meet the very much live spirit of Aligarh Muslim University of the North!

The recommendation, however, is couched in a camouflaged wider recommendation for the development of modern Indian languages, which not being enumerated by names anywhere, may be presumed to be all the 572 mother-tongues. But the thing is not so utterly bad; for though

<sup>67</sup> *Census of India*, 1961, Vol. I, Part II-c (iii), p. CLXIII.

not in the context of this Urdu-uplifting yet in its "earlier" recommendation, at least in the one which I have been able to track,\* p. 16, para 1.62, the modern Indian languages recommended for special treatment are literary languages and not mere mother-tongues. The recommendation for their special treatment, however, is so lukewarm that in the context of the definitive injunction-type recommendation of two higher centres for the cultivation of Urdu, it jars on the reader, who cannot but conclude that the Commission's main concern was with Urdu. It reads:

In every linguistic region, there should be a number of persons who know all the other modern Indian languages and some who are familiar with their literatures and able to contribute to them. For this purpose, we recommend that there should be adequate arrangements, both in schools and colleges, for teaching different modern Indian languages. In addition, steps should be taken to establish strong departments in some of the modern Indian languages in every university. *It may also be advisable to create a small number of special institutes (or advanced centres) for the comparative study of different languages and their linguistic problems.\*\** At the B.A. and M.A. levels, it should be possible to combine two modern Indian languages.

It is seen that in this recommendation about modern Indian languages there is no mention of "the development of modern Indian languages so as to make them fit for higher education".

That in the elaboration of the language policy the Commission had in view the "freeing" of the Urdu-speakers from the need of a fairly deep study of Hindi and from the possibility or the need of having to take higher education through the medium of Hindi—English of course is banned—becomes evident when we study its recommendation which in straightforward language means that there should be no safeguard for other linguistic minorities anywhere in the country. Its recommendation in this behalf reads:

In so far as colleges teaching through the media of modern Indian languages other than the regional language of the area [i.e., the official language of the State] are concerned, there need be no obligation on the State to provide such institutions, except in the cases where an adequate number of students is available. *But if any linguistic minority*

\* I find "English", "Hindi" and 'Urdu' listed in the index but neither Tamil, Marathi, Sanskrit, nor any other language of the VIIIth Schedule. Even the expression "Modern Indian Languages" has no entry in the index, though it is used so many times and even in the chart on p. 194 by the Commission!

\*\* Italics mine.

*group offers to maintain such an institution, it should be permitted and admissible grants given to it.\**

This concession to modern Indian languages other than Urdu, ostensibly so graciously made by the Commission, is a constitutional right of all linguistic minorities guaranteed under Article 29 with its extended application as envisaged by Government Memorandum and resolutions of Chief Ministers' Conference and even of the National Integration Conference! The special contribution of the Commission lies in its effective exclusion of the Urdu-speakers from the permissive field and their firm establishment as the endowed claimants of the exemption from Hindi-medium and of the right of Urdu-medium throughout.

The recession on the linguistic front with its likely disintegrative development in the Urdu-speaking group brings us face to face with the absence of helpful reaction among Muslim Indians towards the great integrational activity of Government.

The first test of the extent of integration the integrational din had succeeded in achieving was afforded by the Chinese invasion. The behaviour of the nation as a whole was satisfactory in this that nothing untoward of any consequence occurred during the active emergency. But one has to remember the fact that the special law keeping in abeyance some of the fundamental freedoms had not only then to be promulgated but has had to be continued till quite a long time after and that the invasion was confined to the north-eastern north-western corners of the country and lasted for a very brief period.

The Defence Fund started at the time of the Chinese invasion, in November 1962, provides a better index of the extent of integration in the country. Between 23 November 1962 when the first list of donations was published and 2 August 1963 when the last was out, lists of donations each of 1,000 rupees or more, there appeared in the *Times of India* 20 such lists. Sixteen lists which I happen to possess, the VIth, XIVth, XVIIth and XVIIIth being wanting, have together 4,560 entries. Of these, not less than 250 are the donations of educational institutions. Educational institutions of all grades thus formed 55 per cent of the total donors, each donating Rs. 1,000 or more. Among these I have come across only 5 educational institutions whose names proclaim them to be Muslim institutions and not less than 42 either Christian or under Christian management to judge by their names. The donations of the individual institutions do not vary much in size. The remaining institutions are Hindu and Jain, Sikh and general.

The Indian Institute of Science figuring in 4 different lists donated more than Rs. 21,000, while the Banaras Hindu University figuring in 6 lists

\* Italics mine.

donated altogether more than Rs. 97,000. One donation of Rs. 12,000 is listed as from the Principal Hindu College which I think must be counted as from the College, though I have not counted it as such in the number mentioned above. Other interesting entries demonstrating reactions of the student community are: Rs. 51,000 from students of Madhya Pradesh, Rs. 20,000 from students of Gwalior and Rs. 5,000 from students of Jammu and Kashmir. I did not meet Aligarh Muslim University among the donors listed in these 16 out of the total of 20 donation-lists, each with a donation of Rs. 1,000 and over. Altogether I have reason to conclude that the response to the appeal of the Defence Fund was very poor from Muslim educational institutions and students.

More than 2 years after the Chinese invasion, on 3 December 1964, the editor of *The Times of India* devoted a leading article to "Indian Muslims", or as would say, Muslim Indians. Mentioning the remarkable fact of the representatives of Muslim Community ventilating "their grievances" twice "in four months" the editor observed:

But the fact remains that Muslims who account for over ten per cent of the country's population as the single largest minority continue to suffer from a sense of alienation from the main stream of national life. This is largely the legacy of the past... The late Mr Jinnah's pernicious two-nation theory was the culmination of the British Government's policy of "divide and rule" [?] and the relative educational backwardness of the Muslims was responsible for their sense of isolation [?] from the majority community. The same backwardness accounts at least partly for the community's under-representation in government services and the country's industrial and commercial life today. The State can and must help the Muslims to overcome this weakness but they themselves must also face the challenge.

This "their facing the challenge" is what I have called Muslim reaction to integrational endeavour and it cannot begin unless Muslim Indians give up their insistence on education being imparted to them in their own Urdu-schools and other institutions. It is only by joining in the common endeavour of total national community education that the requisite mentality for transcending anomie or the automatic condition for removing the sense of isolation and alienation can be achieved.

This very fact about Muslim Indians was expressed by no less a competent statesman than Dr Karan Singh of Jammu and Kashmir within three weeks of *The Times of India* editorial. As reported in *The Times of India* (20-12-'64) Dr Karan Singh said: "The psychological integration of the Indian Muslim in many parts of the country was still not complete." Only 5 months later Mrs Indira Gandhi, the then Union Minister for Information, was reported as addressing "the first convention of the Council for

the Promotion of Communal Harmony"—an ominous event, as such councils, societies, and comradeships busying themselves with harmonies and mass contacts remind one of the fateful decade 1937-1946—at Calcutta. She is supposed to have said that "because of India's troubles with Pakistan [the Pakistani invasion of Kashmir and violation of Kutch border was to come three months later], some Muslims were regarded as spies. This was wrong psychology." Mrs Gandhi is reported to have observed further:

Nothing could be sadder than the fact that although 44 years have passed since Mahatma Gandhi launched his programme for communal amity, they had still to talk about the same thing (*Times of India*, 24-5-'65).

Almost exactly a year after, on the eve of the General Election of February 1967, Dr A. J. Faridi the president of the U.P. Majlis-e-Mushavarat was reported in the issue of *The Times of India* for 21 December 1966 to have said:

It [the Majlis] would support those candidates belonging to various parties who supported the Majlis' election manifesto which demanded among other things, *proportional representation for Muslims in legislatures, maintenance of the present character of the Muslim personal law, use of Urdu as the medium of instruction for Muslims*, [here the reader should bear in mind the demographic fact revealed by the Census of 1961 that whereas there are more than 469 lakhs of Muslim Indians there are only 233 lakhs of persons who have returned Urdu as their mother-tongue ! ], *formation of a minorities commission to examine their grievances and management of Muslim educational institutions and of Muslim trusts by Muslims.* \*

Dr Faridi's frank statement and the Majlis manifesto repeat what 12 years before in 1953 Mr Badrudduja and his Aligarh Convention or Conference demanded and what half a dozen years before Mr Badrudduja's outpouring, Messrs Ismail and Lari and other Muslims had pleaded for before the Constituent Assembly. In short, here is a full-fledged demand for acceptance of the old two nations-theory in practice without giving it the name which is not only odious, but repulsive and horrifying!

The integrational endeavour of the last 6 years is thus seen not to have borne any fruit as far as the Muslim Indian group is concerned.

I have now to draw my reader's attention to the integrational device the Constitution has enshrined in it to fulfil the solemn declaration made about national unity in its noble Preamble and the lack of any vigorous

\* Italics mine.

or even overt attempt made by Government to implement the important Article 44 which is one of the Directive Principles of State Policy.

The Article directs the Union to endeavour to secure a uniform civil code throughout the country. It is thus comprehensively mandatory and the Union Government ought to have carried on appropriate propaganda to mobilize public opinion in that behalf. The Government, on the other hand, proceeded with alacrity to modify the personal law, law about marriages and its dissolution and the laws about inheritance and succession of the largest section of the people, the Hindu Indians. That it is done in the more or less right direction, modernizing it in a fairly rational manner provides the stronger reason why the Government should have simultaneously mobilized public opinion in other sections of the population with a view to putting on the Statute book a rational code of Indian Civil law.

One part of such a code is the law about marriage; and marriage is intimately connected with population, both numbers and quality. As for numbers, the leaders of the country have now realized the need to call a halt to any increase at least for sometime to come. And yet their endeavour in this respect is proceeding under a sobriquet that, providing a camouflage as it does, fails to impinge directly and sharply. The present writer had made a suggestion through the columns of *The Indian Social Reformer* 40 years ago that all marriages should be required to be registered just as births have to be registered. Without intruding into the religious aspect of the marriage laws of any section a marriage registration law could be enacted and implemented. Yet it took not less than half a dozen years for a progressive state like Bombay to put a lukewarm law about registration of marriage on the statute book which it did in 1953. However, there is so much laxity in the law for the registration that the number of marriages taking place every year is anybody's guess! The law regarding age of marriage and consent for all practical purposes depends for its administration and implementation on the sweet will of the people. Twentynine years ago the present writer cooperated with the late Dr A. P. Pillay in the then very strenuous task of organizing in Bombay an All-India Conference on Population and Family Hygiene and succeeded at great cost to have its proceedings published. One of its sections was birth-control in direct and straight words.

In so far as bigamy or polygamy is likely to add to the population problems of the country, it is against the economic interests of the nation. In so far as in a population with a pronounced masculinity, i.e., with the sex-ratio of preponderantly in favour of males, bigamy or polygamy poses other problems which are connected with social and moral health. Among Muslim Indians the sex-ratio is even worse than in the total population. On that count, too i.e., of social and moral welfare, bigamy or polygamy has to be curbed and banned. Further, prohibition of bigamy or polygamy

is in direct line of rational social and moral world-view. Muslim law permits bigamy or restricted polygamy. It is an aspect of Muslim personal law. A number of Muslim members of the Constituent Assembly under more than one Article tried again and again to get the Muslim personal law placed within the charmed circle of sacrosanct and prohibited area but failed to achieve their end.

My limited file of newspaper cuttings provides me with the information that in the Assembly of Maharashtra State a Muslim member Mr M. M. Ismail, president of the Indian Union Muslim League, had in 1963, introduced a bill entitled the Prevention of Bigamous Marriages among Muslims and that the Maharashtra State Muslim League in a meeting specially organized opposed it as being against the basic principles of Islam. In this connection it is desirable to remember that more than one Islamic nation has during the last 5 years passed laws prohibiting bigamy!

I should request the reader to bear in mind further the fact that Yugoslavia, whose Muslim population forms a smaller percentage to the total population of that State than Muslim Indians to the total population of India, has in its Constitution the following provision in Article 26: "Matrimony and family are under the protection of the state. The state regulates by law the legal relations of marriage and the family. *Marriage is valid only if concluded before the competent state organs. After the marriage citizens may go through a religious wedding ceremony*".\* Article 18 which guarantees the right of property is also worth noting as it demonstrates the perfectly rational and modern attitude towards property laws in the total lack of any guarantee of any personal law. It reads: "Private property and private initiative in the economy are guaranteed. The inheritance of private property is guaranteed. *The right of inheritance is regulated by law*" etc.\* Article 22 of the Yugoslav Constitution lays down the duty of citizens regarding observance of laws. It reads: "The citizens of the FPRY are bound to comply with the Constitution and laws". That the so-called separate Republics which in their pluralist Federation become the Yugoslav State even if they are single ethnic-group-formations cannot have valid laws which are in conflict with the federal laws on the specific subject is established by the wording of Article 46 of the Yugoslav Constitution. It reads: "... In case of discrepancy between federal laws and the laws of the republic, federal law shall be applied".

It is an interesting and instructive detail connected with the special meeting of the Maharashtra State Muslim League voicing opposition to the bill for the prevention of bigamous marriages among Muslims that besides the president and the general secretary of the League the one principal speaker was Mr C. H. M. Koya, then a member of the Loka Sabha (*Times of India*, 13-5-'63). From another part of this work readers

\* Italics mine.



will have known about the sudden rise to prominence of this young Muslim leader of Kerala, who is currently, if I am not mistaken, the Education Minister of that State in the Namboodripad Ministry.

Two and a half months later on 29 July 1963, there appeared an editorial headed "Islamic Law" in *The Times of India*. The occasion was evidently provided by "the current demand in Pakistan for the repeal of the Family Laws Ordinance". The editor began by pointing out that that demand held "more than one lesson for the Indian Government". The first lesson as the editor rightly emphasized is in his own words: "... a warning that the case for a reform of Islamic personal law by Parliament should not be based on what is or is not done in the predominantly Muslim countries but should rest on what is considered desirable in this country." *Inter alia* the editor mentioned a proposal of the Union Law Ministry "to appoint a committee to examine the changes made in Islamic law in Muslim countries" with a view to determining what changes Parliament should undertake. But when the editor postulated the probability of Muslim Indians, "the progressive elements" among them of course, wanting "bolder changes" than those effected in the personal law by other Islamic nations like U.A.R., Syria, Lebanon and even Pakistan, he had evidently forgotten the fate of Mr M. M. Ismail's modest proposal, to prevent bigamous marriages among them, which he had tabled for being moved in the Maharashtra Assembly, narrated above! And he went on naively to add that "in addition to the abolition of polygamy there is a great deal to be said for making changes in the Islamic law governing inheritance". His further suggestion that divorce law of Muslim Indians needed to be tightened up to bring up to the level of the law operative among non-Muslim Indians was eminently right. When in the next breath, the editor thought of expediency, a usual sobriquet for procrastination, in the way he did, he did not realize that the Constitution of India which directs, in its Article 44, the State to endeavour to secure a uniform civil code of laws was already 14 years old and today at least has arrived at that age which for purposes of marriage must be considered to be the age of majority! His philosophizing runs thus: "Uniformity in personal laws is doubtless desirable, but what is desirable is not always immediately possible; and this is particularly true in Indian conditions."

To put the best construction on his final throwing up of hands one cannot but say that he was crying for the moon when he wrote:

It is the responsibility of the progressive Muslims who wish to bring Islamic law into accord with the temper of the times to convince Muslim opinion of the need for change. They have shirked the responsibility long enough.

• It is nearly 3 years after the learned editor advised both the Government

of India (Bharat) and rated "the progressive Muslims" for having "shirked" their "responsibility long enough" that my very poor file of newspaper-cuttings provides me with any data regarding the effect that the editor's advice and rating had.

In the news despatch from Delhi dated 17 May 1966 in the same valued paper (*Times of India*, 18-5-'66) we read that the then Law Minister Mr G. S. Phatak, the new blood that had replaced the old stolidly adjusted incumbent but which proved rather quick-running—Mr Pathak went out of the new Union Government of 1967 March—stated in the Loka Sabha that the Government had to proceed with caution in the matter of securing a common civil code as "personal laws are mixed up with religion", on Mr S. N. Das having asked whether steps had been taken to mobilize public opinion among Muslim Indians for the reception of a comprehensive common civil code. On Mr Phatak's statement several members questioned him about the Government's activity in creating Muslim public opinion.

Mr Mohd. Ismail, the redoubtable champion of separatism since the sitting of the Constituent Assembly, put up the usual argument, but in the contemporary context a patently wrong argument of the "Shariat" law, and asked the Government if it would coerce the Muslim community to follow common civil law. The Minister of State for Law on behalf of the Government expressed inability to agree with the viewpoint of Mr Ismail about the personal law being all a matter of religion, pointing out that many Muslim countries had already changed over to monogamy. Mr Prakash Vir Shastri pointed out the high rate of increase of Muslim Indians as revealed by the Census of 1961. Whereas the total population of India had increased in the decennium 1951-1961 by 24 per cent the Muslim Indians had grown during it by 38 per cent, he stated! Mr Pat-tabhiraman, the Minister of State for Law added the information in partial explanation of the differential increase of populations that "he was aware of the fact that people changed their religion for purposes of remarriage."

The Union Ministry of Law evidently had moved somewhat in the matter of gauging public opinion if not in mobilizing it. *The Times of India* of 5 December 1956 brought the news that the Ministry had addressed letters to the States asking them if in view of the law of monogamy having been the established law among all sections of the Indian people except Muslim Indians, it was not right and proper to abolish the law permitting polygamy which existed among the latter. What replies, if any, the States gave is not known, but exactly after two months in the 6 February 1967 issue of the same paper one reads the intriguing news that Mrs Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, in her election campaign assured "the minorities" that no decision regarding any change in Muslim law would be taken without consulting them.

And as chance would have it only 10 days after Mrs Indira Gandhi's

assurance a curious little piece of news substantiating, at least in the minds of the public, much of what was talked about in private but not published in papers and was presumably happening since Pakistan had invaded Kashmir and violated the Kutch boundary, leaked out in the columns of *The Times of India*. In the issue of that paper for 15 February 1967, Mr P. C. Sen, the then Chief Minister of West Bengal, is reported as having told a deputation of Muslims, who had called on him to demand redress of Muslim grievances, that out of the 70 lakhs (seven millions) of Muslims in West Bengal 631 had been detained during the conflict with Pakistan in 1965 under the Defence of India Regulation. As against this only 120 Hindus had been similarly treated. The relative proportions of detentions which were made by a Congress Government, which readily acceded to the demand for a judicial committee of enquiry into them, is staggeringly against any optimistic view of integration of Muslim Indians proceeding a pace ! \*

The other religious minority of importance in the country is formed by the Christians whose exemplary behaviour at the sessions of the Constituent Assembly has earned the encomium of all. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, a member of that minority group, who was a member of the Union Government for some years, giving evidence before the Committee on National Integration and Communalism appointed by the National Integration Conference, on 9 September 1962, asserted that a number of happenings and trends "went to show that the Indian people were more divided now than they had been before independence". Yet, she assured the Committee, "Christians were fully Indian and did not look outside the country for any help or guidance. *Nor did they claim to have any distinctive Christian culture.*" She further told the Committee that the "separatist movement of DMK was a 'tragic' development." (*Times of India*, 10-9-'62. *Italics mine*). Rajkumari Kaur's statement about Christians, it may be noted, made when she had gone out of Government, was a sort of an underlining or expounding of the sentiment expressed by Dr J. M. D'Souza, President of the Catholic Association before the same Committee on 21 August 1962 that "Catholics were Indians first and Catholics later" (*Times of India*, 22-8-'62).

Three years after this, after the Chinese danger had receded and after India had registered a resounding victory over aggressive Pakistan, on 30 December 1965 we were presented with rather a mixed fare of news about Christian attitude and that too from Bengal! The Conference of the All-India Council of Indian Christians held in Calcutta on 29 December is reported to have demanded increased representation for the Chris-

\* On 6 July 1967 *The Times of India* contained the intriguing news that about 15,000 people from Rajasthan (Muslims) had left for Pakistan during the Indo-Pakistan conflict of September 1965 and that they were trying to re-enter their States, Gujarat and Rajasthan.

tians in State Legislative Assemblies and in Parliament. At the same time, however, the Conference called upon Christian Indians to contribute liberally to the National Defence Fund (*Times of India*, 30-12-'65).

Within 6 months of this mixed news, the Christian peace conference was held in Bombay some time in May 1966 which must have passed some resolutions indicative of a further separatist fissure. For we read in the papers soon thereafter, in connection with the reports of the A.I.C.C. meeting, which was held in Bombay, that a Christian deputation called on Mrs Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, and that it demanded minority status for Christians. It is reported to have pointed out that the Muslim Indians had already been accorded that status [?].

To complete the story of the separatist trend, the Muslim League unit of Mysore taking part in elections there for the first time put up a Christian candidate to show its "secular character". If the action of the Muslim League outwardly at least was meant to establish its secular character, the willing acceptance of the ticket by a Christian Indian indicated his readiness to be separated from the Indian nation as a whole.

Such is the story of the nature of the processes that have been at work for two decades, without conscious sponsoring of the Government, and of the nature and extent of conscious integrational activity of the Government for about 6 years. Can we conclude with any other statement than that prospects for national solidarity are rather bleak?

## INDEX

- ABID HUSAIN**, on Liberation of Indian Muslims, 217  
**Absorption**, 32  
**Abu Yazid**—Probably influenced by Patanjala System, 152  
**Accommodation**, 31, 36  
**Dr Ahmed Z. A.**, and Muslim conference, 500  
**Acculturative Assimilative Process** in America—Marden, Charles F., on 58, 59  
**Ajanta Frescoes** on Chalukya Monarch Pulakesin Receiving Persian Courtiers, 244  
**Akbar's Attempt** at a composite Faith of Kabir—Tara Chand on, 196, 197  
**Akbar's Effort** at integration and Rajputs, 200  
**Akbar's Reign**—Appraisal of the Indian Scene in by Qureshi, Pakistani or Islamic, 134  
**Akbar's religions** to Political innovating, 135  
**Aligarh Muslim University**, 404  
     —Mr Sharma on, 401  
     —Mr Ananthasayanam Ayyangar on Communal Happenings, 401  
**Aligarh Muslim University**, Amendment Art, 370-74  
**Aligarh Muslim University**, Inquiry Committee, 369  
**Aligarh riots**, 337, 342  
**Aligarh and Western Pakistan**—Constant Traffic between, 303  
**All-India Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu**, 392  
**All-India Congress Committee**—on Urdu in U.P., 461  
**All-India Federal Government**, 292  
**All-India Muslim Conference (1954)**, 359  
**All-India Muslim League Conference**—Mr Mohammad Ismail on, 398  
**All-India Services** in the Engineering, Medical and Forestry Departments, 499  
**Alphabets**,  
     —Arabic, 458  
     —Devanagiri, 459  
     —Latin, 458  
     —Russian, 457, 458  
     —Uniform 459, in U.S.S.R.  
**Alphabet and the Education Commission**, 468  
**Amalgamation**, 31  
**Ambedkar**—on Solution of the Minority Problem, 118, 445  
**American City Community**, 13  
**American Nation Community**, 14  
**Angell, Prof. Robert**,  
     —on Conflicting Note of Variety of Groups in American Society, 12  
     —Free, Standing Groups, 12  
     —Common Orientation, 12  
     —Friction and Conflict due to Multiplication of Groups, 12  
     —Classification of Groups, 12, 33  
**Anjuman-i-Tarqi-e-Urdu**—on Urdu in U.P., 463, 465  
**Annadurai**,  
     —implementing his election manifesto, 515  
     —Hostility to Sanskrit and Devanagari Script, 516  
**Anti-discriminationary Provisions**, in India, in tune with Standard Minority in

- right, 116
- Anti-Hindi Agitation, 477, 479
- Appar and Sambandar, 184
- Arabs and Persian—Al Beruni on Study of, 403
- Arch, Hindu use of, Fergusson on, 252
- Arch, pointed, 226
- Aron, Prof. Raymond, 25
- Art and Architecture and Original ideas of the Hindus, not affected by Muslim rule, 248
- Aryan and Dravidian Antagonism, Haimayun Kabir on, 181
- Ascetics rescuing Hindus with armed opposition, from Muslim endeavour against Hindu religion and Culture, 128
- Asoka Mehta on Riots, 337
- Assimilation, Concept of, 32
- BADARAYANA'S BRAHMASUTRAS, giving the tenets of Vedanta, 164
- Bahamani Kingdoms in the Deccan, 194
- Bakshi Gulam Mohammad, 463
- Bain Read, 12
- Banaras Hindu University, 414
- Bardir, S. S. Ahmed, proclaiming 'Jihad' 209
- Barth, A., on Tamil literature, 145, 146
- Barth's Concept of *Bhakti*, 146, 147
- Bauer—Renner plan, 55
- Beatrice King, on U.S.S.R. Educational System, 453, 454
- Beloff, Max, on Indian Constitution, 127
- Bengali Intellectuals, on Hindi, 523
- Bengali Religious Poetry, 250, 251
- Bengal Temples, Vincent Smith on, 251
- "Bhakti", 183, 169
- Bharavi, great Sanskrit poet, 158, 159, 160, 161
- Bhavabhuti, expounding monistic philosophy, 161, 162
- Bijapur and Golkonda Kingdoms, 195
- Bhopal riots, 319, 320
- Black Muslims, 62
- "Black Power", Walter Lippmann on, 62, 63
- Blau, Peter M., on social integration, 35
- Booker, T. Washington, the great Negro leader, 61
- Bulbous dome, Brown on, 227
- CABINET MISSION, 282, 291, 293, 294
- 298
- Cachar Saugam Parishad, 473, 475
- Cenotaphs of Udaipur monarchs, 232, 233, 247
- Chagla, M. C.,
- on Indian secularism, 425, 426
- on minorities in India, 426
- on Muslims of India and the two-nation theory, 426
- Chamberlain, Sir Austin, on minorities and the national life, 52
- Chartist violence, Prof. Dobree on, 2
- Chavan, Y. B., 521
- Chinaswamy, on self immolation, 479
- Chinese invasion of India, 505
- Christians in India, demanded the status of a minority, 44
- Choudhary, K., on partition, 296
- on the duties of Muslims in India, 296
- Claude, Dr., on Kin-State and Host-State, 43
- Coleman, James, on adult voluntary organisations, 13
- Coleman, Prof., on integration and pluralism, 488
- Commission on Human Rights, on minorities, 82, 86, 99
- Communal conflict, Aziz Ahmed on, 192
- Community Sentiment, MacIver on, 15
- Communal Unity, 26
- Complex of Linguistic Tensions, Vishwanath Das on, 436
- Comprehensive Solidarity, 15
- Conflict, connected with national culture, 55
- Conflict between Hindu and Muslim rulers began in the Deccan, 193
- Conflict between Muslim powers and Kings of Vijayanagara, 193
- Conflict, considered as a form of attitude, by MacIver and Page, 26
- Conflict, defined by Robin M. Williams, 24
- Conflict of Classes, 33
- Conflict, as an integrating process, 23
- Conflict, integrative role of, 24
- Conflict, concept of, 16
- Conflict, within an individual, 26
- Congress, 284, 287
- Congress, in power, 311
- Congress Working Committee, 289, 291, 292, 293, 294, 302

- Constitution of India, recognising minorities on language and religion, 44**  
**Constituent Assembly, 292, 294**  
**"Constructive Conflict" of Miss Follett, 24**  
**Cooperation and Conflict, Prof. MacIver on, 23**  
**Corridor between West and East Pakistan, 295**  
**Cultural Autonomy, 15**  
**Cultural Autonomy, E. Kedourie on, 74**  
**Cultural Autonomy, Dr Latif on, 267**  
**Cultural Autonomy and Minority Rights, Humphrey on, 106**  
**Culturally Diverse Community, 70**  
**Cultural History of India, 130**  
**Cultural Federalism or National Federation, 53, 54**  
**Cultural Pluralism, 75**  
**Cultural Pluralism of American Intellectuals, 64**  
**Cultural Pluralism, Brown, Rousek and Payne on, 57, 58**  
**Cultural Pluralism or Plural Society, 56**  
**Cultural Pluralism or Cultural Autonomy, K. Deutsch on, 108, 109**  
**Cultural Pluralism, Williams on, 61**  
  
**DADU & DADUPANTHI SECT, Qureshi on, 197**  
**Dadupanthi Sect and influence on Vairagis and the Sikhs, Aziz Ahmed on, 197**  
**Dar-ul-Harb, 382**  
**Davis, Prof. Kingsley, 25**  
**Dawoodi Bohras & Their convention, 389, 390**  
**Deccan Muslim Block of Dr Latif, 270, 271**  
**Defence Fund and Integration, 528, 529**  
**—Par from Muslim Students, 529**  
**Dehlavi, Shah Waliullah,**  
**—proclaiming "Jihad" and India 'Dar-ul-harb', 209**  
**—Aziz Ahmad on, 210**  
**—Qureshi on, 209, 210**  
**—Dr Yasin on, 210**  
**Delhi Lucknow Block—for Muslims of U.P., 274**  
**Delhi Sultanate & Cultural forces of Islam, Prof. Abid Husain on, 237**  
**Democracy and the will of the majority, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on, 122**  
  
**Deutsch, Prof. Karl W.,**  
**—Concept of integration, 37**  
**—on Nationality, 38**  
**Deoband in U.P., 211**  
**—Abid Husain on, 218**  
**Determined opposition of the two communities, 196**  
**Dhar Commission, 489**  
**Diesing, Paul, on economic rationality, 37**  
**—on social stratification, 38**  
**Different groups and multiplicity of languages, 104**  
**Directive Principles of State Policy—to foster unity of the nation and uniform civil code, 128**  
**Domination, 28**  
**Donald Young, 15**  
**Dravidian Progressive Federation or Dravida Kazhagam, 506**  
**—and "we tamils" movement, 507,**  
**—burning of map of India, 507**  
**"Dravidastan, the cry of"**  
**—Pandit Nehru on, 509**  
**—C. Subramaniam on, 509**  
**—Kamraj on, 508**  
**Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, 506**  
**—Demand 'Dravidanad'—508**  
**—Change in views—509**  
**—dropping out goal of 'independent Dravida Nad', 510, 511**  
**—proposed burning of the Indian constitution dropped, 511**  
**—C. N. Annadurai on election manifesto of, 513**  
**Dutta, Jatindra Mohan, on massacres of Hindus by Tughlak and Bahamani Kings, 208, 209**  
  
**ECONOMIC & SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE U.N., Humphrey on, 100**  
**Education Commission, 448**  
**—for Language study—Patterns, 451**  
**—on alphabet, 454, 468**  
**—3 language formula, 468**  
**—on Devanagari script, 468, 469**  
**Education Commission,**  
**—and linguistic policy, 524-525**  
**—dethroning Sanskrit for enthroning Urdu, 524**  
**—and three language formula, 528**  
**Educational Institutions for Liberalization of Article 30 to minority—positively malintegrative, 523, 524**

- Elijah Muhammed designated the Messiah by C. Eric Lincoln, 62  
 —leader of the Black Muslim, 63  
 Eliot, on interlocking memberships and ramification of individual memberships, 13  
 Emerson, Prof. Rupert, on linguistic tensions, 430  
 —on international communications, 430  
 Emotional integration,  
 —committees on, 402, 403, 498, 499  
 —deeper than political integration, 499  
 —and building up an Indian society, Nehru on, 499  
 Emotional Integration committee—maligning Brahmin caste, 214  
 Emotional Integration committee, 448, 451, 454  
 Engineers of Aligarh Muslim University, flight of to Pakistan, 496  
 English & Hindi—Level of Study in, 452  
 English Knowing—progress greater than that of Hindi knowing, 484  
 Ethnic group defined, 17, 18  
 Ethnic and racial groups—Prof. MacIver on, 2  
 Ethnic and racial groups, 26  
 Etzioni Amitai on integration, 37  
 Eubank—concept of group becoming main foundation of systematic sociology, 12  
 Europe & integration, 28, 29  
 European Economic community, 33
- FAKHRUDDIN AHMED — on Muslims not to isolate themselves, 424  
 Fakhruddin Ahmed, 389  
 Dr A. J. Faridi — on safeguards for minorities, 530  
 Fate of Minorities, U.N. Resolution on, 83  
 Federalism—of MacIver, 16  
 Federalism, 15  
 Federation, 15  
 Federal States & National States, 104  
 Federative principle,  
 —assumed in 'Federalism', 16  
 —MacIver on, 17  
 —associations recognised in, 17  
 —social groups not mentioned, 17  
 —class and caste in, 17
- ethics or racial groups absent, 17  
 Follet, Miss, 29  
 Follet on integration, 37  
 Food—Asharaf & Yasin on, 189, 190  
 —Beef, common sustenance of ordinary muslim, 190  
 Four plans of Muslims,  
 —demanded complete parity, 286  
 Frank Anthony, on safeguards for minorities, 120, 121  
 Dr Frank C. Laubach,  
 —on Devanagari alphabet, 469  
 Freedom of Conscience guaranteed to all in India, 116  
 French Canadians—case study on by Wagley and Harris, 64  
 French handover of Pondicherry to the British, 219  
 Frustration—by All-India Muslim convention, 302  
 Frustration—in South India on language issue, 438  
 Frustration of Muslims, 263  
 Full autonomy in religion guaranteed in India, 116  
 Fundamental processes of interaction, 31  
 Fundamental rights of individuals, 294, 301  
 Fusion, 31  
 Fusion between Hindu and Muslim styles of architecture—Tara Chand on, 232, 233  
 Fusion of Hindu-Muslim culture,  
 —Cunningham on, 253  
 —Fergusson on, 254  
 Fyzee on Kashmir, 420  
 Fyzee, on potentiality for unity, 402  
 —on Radhakrishna Commission, 402  
 —on Commission for Arabic & Persian, 402, 403
- GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE U.N. on MINORITIES, 82, 83  
 General Elections, 282-290  
 Genocide Convention, 83, 100  
 Goode, William, on relations between social & cultural integration, 36  
 Gordon, Milton M., on community integration for pluralistic integration, 32  
 Govt. of India Act—and Provincial Autonomy, 130  
 Groups & Associations—a conspectus of, 12



- Groups are sociological wholes, 13  
 Group characteristics and traditions, autonomous development of, 107  
 Groups—Communal, racial, occupational or professional, ideal or maternal, 18, 19  
 Group concept, 18, 19  
 Group—definition of, 18  
 Groups—divided into 3 classes—Political Parties, Interest Associations, Categorical groups, 18  
 Groups of elites—Prof. Angell on, 19  
 Groups—ethnic race—conscious or racial, 17  
 Groups—existence for group rights of minorities, 48  
 Groups—hostility definition of—by Robin M. Williams, 7  
 Groups—and integration, 19  
 Groups—integrative functions of, 12  
 Groups—integrative role of, 19-20  
 Groups—native function of, 11  
 Groups—Prof. Davis on, 25  
 Groups—ramifications of contacts of, 20  
 Groups—significance of diagrammatic representation of, 11  
 Groups—sociological classification of, 19  
   —role of, in society, 19  
 Groups—as socializers of Individuals, 10  
 Groups & tensions, 71, 72  
 Groups theory or field theory of Kurt Lewin, 13  
 Group—as a primary concept defined, 17  
 Groups of tensions—Nine distinct reorganized by Japanese Sociologists, 9  
 Group tension or social tension—best description of, 8  
 Gujarat & Saurashtra culture carried to Malaya & Indo-China,  
   —Dr Ahmed H. Dani on, 244  
 Growse,  
   —on Bulandshahr District of U.P., 246-247  
   —on Sas-Brahu temple & Brindavan temple, 248-249  
   —on architectural endeavour of the Rajaputs, 247  
 "Guru" Jagadguru tradition, 185  
 Guru raising of in Ramanuja school, 186  
 Guru Temple—registered in Mathura inscription, 185, 186
- Hailakandi episode, 475, 476  
 Hart, Prof. Hemell, 33  
 Hatim Jaliwala,  
   —on riots by Muslims in Kashmir and East Pakistan, 417  
 Hiatus—Thesis of Abid Husain, 235, 236  
   —Qureshi on, 240  
   —Thesis disproved by enormous temple building activity, 241  
   —Tara Chand on, 241  
 Hindi,  
   —attitude on Bengali-speakers and Tamil-speakers, 484  
 Hindi in Devanagiri Script, 301  
 Hindi, in Devanagari to be official language of the Indian Union, 431, 443  
   —T. T. Krishnamachari on, 436  
   —N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar on, 437  
   —Seth Govind Das on, 437  
 Hindi imperialism,  
   —S. Nagappa and O. V. Alagessan on, 437  
 Hindi Opposition in Madras and in Mysore, 480  
   —Kamraj on, 480  
 Hindi propagation, 483  
 Hindu Architecture, void in, 247  
 Hindus and Muslims—interest opposition set and hardened, 207  
 Hindus of the Deccan and challenge of Islamization, 196  
 Hindu Muslim clashes in Aligarh University, 395  
 Hindu-Muslim problems, 284, 289  
 Hindus, opposition of the, after the Rajputs, carried on by Jats, Marathas and Sikhs, 209  
 Hindustan block of the Hindus—Dr Latif on, 237  
 'Hindustan Hamara', 393  
 Hindustani culture,  
   —Prof. Abid Husain on, 186, 238  
   —Aziz Ahmad on, 208  
 Hindustani in Roman Script, 442  
 Hindustan State, 297  
 Hindu Temples in Delhi and Ajmer—Fergusson on, 202  
 Hindu Temples and destruction by Muslim rulers,  
   —General Cunningham on, 205  
   —Abid Hussain on, 205  
   —Qureshi on, 205, 206  
 Hindu temples and prohibitory laws of

- Muslims Monarchs non-Hindu writers on, 205
- Humayun Kabir on, 205
- Hindu Temples—destroyed by Muslims General & Nomads, 243
- Hindu temples of Khajuraho and Mahaboba, 246
- General Cunningham on, 246
- Hindu temples and palaces in good taste —Fergusson on, 258
- Home Ministry,
- to revive National Integration Council, 514
- Hoysalas of Dwarasamudra and Vijayanagar dynasties, architecture of, 256
- Human Rights Covenant, 103
- and Eisenhower Administration of U.S.A., 111
- Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms,
- Convention (European) on, 84
- Humayun Kabir,
- on Islamic influence on Shankaracharya, 150
- on Vedanta of Sankara, 137
- Huns and Gurjars—destructive role of—disproved by Rajput tradition, Col. Tod on, 245
- Hyder Ali, 219
- Hyderabad Federation—concept of, 265, 266
- Hyderabad State,
- conceived as centre of Muslim concentration, 287
- INDIA—Prof. Robert E. Park on her Govt., 113
- Prof. Park's prophecy belied, 113
- Democratic Constitution framed thro' Constituent Assembly, 113
- Indian architecture,
- Tara Chand on, 222
- James Fergusson on, militated on Tara Chand's Thesis, 222
- E. B. Havell on, 222, 223
- Percy Brown on, 224
- Indian architecture, Tarachand on Muslim impact on, 223
- India Christians and integration,
- Raj Kumari Amrit Kaur on 535
- A delegation to the Prime Minister demanding minority status, 536
- Indian costume,
- Ashraf on, 188, 189
- Yasin on, 189
- Indian culture—declared "composite", 116
- Indian culture—pre-Muslim post-Muslim, 267
- Indian Muslims,
- Convention of, 386, 388, 392
- frustration among, 388
- Indian Muslim Nationalism, concept of, 263
- Indian Political History—Books on—by Ishtaq Husain Qureshi, Hafeez, Malik and Aziz Ahmed—Pro-Pakistani and give the view of the Islamic school of history, 131
- Indian states, 286
- Indigenous groups and voluntary migrant groups should get identical treatment, 107.
- Individual, and his right, 77
- and his duties to the community, 77
- Individuals of minority rights guaranteed to rather than, as minority as groups, 52
- Indo-Saracenic style of architecture—Prof. Humayan Kabir on, 224
- Inner Conflicts, 26
- Integral community, 14
- "Integrate" and "disintegrate"—MacIver on, 16
- Integrated personality, 27
- Integrated personality—concept of, 33
- Integrated Society and language, 33
- Integrated totality, 34
- Integration, 27, 28, 32
- Integration,
- common institutions, additional essential for, 32
- concept of, 10
- and primary group, 17
- by conclusive discussion, 29
- Integration with differentiation, 28
- Integration—definition of the concept of, 34
- Integration—Economists' view, 37
- Integration—envisioned by the Indian Constitution, 116
- Integration—evidence of aggression on the linguistic front, 522, 523
- Integration—Humphrey equating with assimilation, 100
- concept introduced by American

- Sociologists, 101
- Integration—on the physio-psychological plane, 28
- on the psycho-social plane, 28
- Integration—Political Scientists' view, 38
- Integration—as the principal aim of the Indian constitution, 128
- Integration of Society—a goal of man's development, 34
- Integration—Supreme Court on, *vis-a-vis* Negroes, 38
- Integration—conflict, competition and cooperation, the three important forms of, 25
- Integrational endeavour of the Government, 514, 515
- not borne any fruit with Muslim Indian group, 530
- Integrative action of the nervous system, 27
- Integrative devices and the Constitution—Govt's effort not vigorous, 530, 531, 536
- Integrative function, of the nervous system in the human individual, 30
- Integrative Technique, 497
- Integrative Unity, 27
- Interaction—Prof. Kimball Young, on, 22
- 7 processes specified by Prof. Young, 23
- Interdependence, 17
- Inter-group conflict—caused by rapid change with strain and tension, 7
- Inter-group tensions—is like an iceberg, 8
- Intergroup tensions—commonly disruptive and fissiparous, 5
- Intergroup tensions—Prof. R. M. MacIver on, 2
- Internalization, individual's, of image of his Society, 19
- International community—not in existence yet, 16
- International tensions, conditions of, 2
- International tensions—solution of, by Robert M. Williams, 7
- International tensions—UNESCO's concern with, 9
- Iqbal on Muslim State, 200
- Iqbal, the poet and spiritual father of Pakistan, 135
- Intra-group process—repetition of integration, 33
- Intra-group tensions—study by W. R. Brion and J. Richman, 7
- Islam, upon Hindu sect, in the South, 171
- Islam and Hinduism—viewed to be opposite by Aziz Ahmad, 135
- Islam's influence on Hindu thought—Barth's and Fawcett's views, 140
- Islam in India, rehabilitation of, Aziz Ahmad on, 216
- Islamic architecture in half a dozen styles, E. B. Havell on, 223
- Islamic impact on the Bhakti movement—Abid Husain on, 143
- Islamic influence on Hindu religious architecture, 252
- Islamic influence in South India—Qureshi on, 172
- Islamic people, unity—concept of, 261
- Islamic school of Historians, 129
- Islamic thought influencing Philosophy of Shankaracharya and Ramanuja—assertion by Muslim writers, 136
- Abid Hussain on, 138
- JABALPUR RIOTS, 329-334
- Jacob, Philip E., & Lindburg, Leon N., on integration, 40
- Jai Hind, 296
- Jahangir,
- & Islamic orthodoxy, 200
- Hafeez Malik on, 200
- Di Yasin on, 201
- Jamiat-i-Islami, 381-6, 423; Fostering Muslim isolation, 400
- Jami Masjid at Ajmer, Prof Abid Husain on, 237
- Jamiat-ul-ulema, 399
- Maulana Hifzur Rahman on, 399
- Jamiat-ul-ulema, 362, 381, 415, 423
- Java—colonised by people from Gujarat—Radha Kumud Mookerji on, 243
- Jaya Prakash Narayan on Bengali in Assam, 473, 475
- Jews & self-hatred, 5, 6
- Jizya—Aziz Ahmed on, 135
- Jamaican Society & pluralistic framework—Smith, Klass on, 69
- Jinnah—on creation of Two Indias, 279, 280, 282, 287
- Jnanesvara, Trara Chand on, 172

- John Ali—National secretary of the Black Muslims, 64  
 Joshua Whatmouth—on Dravidan Telugu in Andhra State, 430  
 —on interlingual communication, 431  
 —language teaching, 453, 454

KABIR & HIS TEACHINGS—Qureshi on, 197

- Kabir on growth of a new language, 187  
 Kashmir State—division of, envisaged in Latif's plan, 273  
 Kedareshvara temple at Halebid  
 —Fergusson on, 256  
 —Perry Brown on, 257  
 Kerala Muslims, 363-4  
 Khafikhan on riots, 305  
 Kohn, Hans on problem of Muslims, 45  
 Kohn—on minorities, 45, on untouchability, 45  
 Kohn, on Negroes Asians, 46  
 Koya, C. H. Mohamad, 363-5

LAL BHADUR SHASTRI, 402, 420, 272, 474, 479

- on minorities, 503  
 Landecker on—cultural integration and normative integration, communicative integration, 35  
 Landecker's Werner's, 4 types of Social Integration, 34  
 Language—Indian National Congress on, 443  
 Language conflict in Assam—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, 470  
 Language and Integrated Society, 33  
 Language and Muslims, 301  
 Language and national development, 105  
 Languages. North Indian, South Indian, 466  
 Language, Policy of U.S.S.R., 456  
 Language & Social Integration, 33  
 Laponce, J. A. — supports elimination of minorities by absorption, 54  
 Latif, (Dr) 294, 295  
 League Assembly on duties of Minority, 52  
 Level of tension, conditions inter-group hostility, 7  
 Linguistic minorities and groups, 43  
 Linguistic minorities,  
 —instruction at primary stage in mothertongue, 431

- special officer for, 431  
 —Safeguard for, 431  
 —States Reorganisation Commission on, 432  
 —And Govt. Policy, 433

Linguistic minorities—instruction through the mother tongue of at the secondary stage, 505 •

Linguistic minorities—special officer provided for, 126

Linguistic minorities and language, 500  
 Linguistic Minorities and Urdu-speakers, 481, 482

Linguistic and religious rights guaranteed under the Indian constitution, 114

Linguistic tensions, 476, 477

Linguistic tensions and sections of the Indian people, 42

Lord Wavell, 290

Loyalty to an in-group, 17

MUSLIM ORGANISATIONS IN U.P.,

—working for Muslim exclusivism, 400  
 Muslim League

—and extravagant Aspirations, 295

Mountbatten, Lord, 295

Muslim Federation,

—Doctors Hasan & Qadri on, 299

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, 288, 289, 290, 294, 295, 296, 301, 302

—on Muslims & Other Minorities, 297

—On Pakistan, 297

—on Non-Muslims, 298

Manjasur (Mangalore?)

—Hindu-Muslim riot in, 304

Menon, V. P., 280, 288, 289, 291, 292, 293, 294

Mahatma Gandhi, 280, 288, 289, 291, 294

Muslim State of Pakistan, 283

Muslim League & Concept of Separate Muslim Nation,

—demand for Minority Safeguards 259

Montague-Chelmsford reforms & Muslims of India, 261

Mehkri, Dr. G. H.,

—on Iqbal, 260

—on Gulkhan, 261

—on Muslim India & Hindu India, 261

Maulana Mohamed Ali,

- Founding Jama Millia Islamia, 262
- Muslim State,
  - Iqbal, Jinnah on, 260
- Muslim Aspirations, 275
- Maulana Hifzur Rahman, 386
  - and S. R. Kidwai, 387
  - and Muslim Convention, 396
- Muslim Rule in India—destructive role, of confirmed by Col. Tod, General Cunningham, Fergusson, Burgess, Brown & others, 245
- Man Singh's Govinda Deva Temple, 248
  - an exception, 249
  - Perry Brown on, 250
- Muslim Civil Architecture—Fergusson & Brown on, 252, 253
- Muslim Architecture, decadence of,
  - Brown on, 257
  - Fergusson on, 257, 258
- Muslim Monarchs & Hindu Temples; Aziz Ahmad on, 203
- Mosques Built by Muslim Rulers,
  - Percy Brown on, 204
  - Fergusson on, 204
- Mujahidin Movement,
  - Aziz Ahmad on, 217
  - Arnold Toynbee on, 217
- Muslim Kingdoms of the Deccan & External Orientation, 220
- Marathas, 219
- Muslim Architecture derived from Hindu Origins,
  - Fergusson & Burges on, 223
  - E. B. Havell on, 223
- Muslim Architecture of Bahamani & Post-Bahamani Period, derived from Hindu tradition
  - Havell on, 225, 226
- Muslim Arch,
  - see Arch, Pointed
- Marriage Celebrations, common manner of, 190
- Mewad, Typifying political situation, 196
- Mediaeval Reconciliation,
  - Humayun Kabir on, 187
- Minority & Separatism & Injustice, 122
  - Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on, 122
- Minorities, in India, not recognized in the technical sense & international content, 115
- Muslim idealization of Aurangzeb,
  - S. M. Jaffar on, 129
- Mystic Thought & Practice, 153
- Minorities, in the New World,
  - native, immigrant, racial or ethnic, 113
- Motilal Nehru Report & Fundamental Rights,
  - Primary instruction to children of minorities to be in their language & Script, 114
- 'Minority' in India, meant the whole of Muslim group, 114
- Muslim children to be taught in the primary stage in Urdu in Persian lettering, 114
- Minority, discrimination against, 118
- Majority-duty of, 118
- Monistic Thought, 153, 155
  - Already in Kalidasa's *Shakuntala*, 156
- Meghaduta* of Kalidasa-Vedantic Terms, in, 156
- "Mathas"—Organisation of Asectics,
  - known in Shankaracharya's time, 168
- "Matha" existed at Mylapore before 6th century A.D., 168
- "Mathas",
  - Panchatantra* on, 167
- Multi-nationalism & Minority protection, 110
- Minorities—Louis Hankins on, 111
- Multi-national society,
  - Seminar organized by Mr. John P. Humphrey on, 89, 91
  - Humphrey on, 95, 96
- Multi-national State,
  - Janowsky on, 96
- Minorities—Historical, 97
  - Trygve Lie's description, 97
- Minorities—Prevention of Discrimination & Protection of
  - U.N. on, 81
  - Subcommission on, 86, 88
  - Humphrey on Subcommission, 99
- Multi-national country—Yugoslavia's characterised as, 98
- Maulana Hifzur Rahman, 407, 500, 502
- Muslims of Bombay,
  - condemn Pakistani atrocities, 418
- Muslims of India,
  - Unanimous view that Kashmir was part of India, 419
- Majlis-e-Musha-Warat, 423

Majiat-ul-Ulema, 423, 424  
 Morarji Desai, 424, 425  
 Maharashtra State Muslim League, 427  
 Minorities—Brown on, 71  
 Minorities in the Arab World,  
   —A. H. Hourani on, 74  
 Muslim Indians—are a religious minority,  
   43, 44  
 Minority—in Political Science & inter-  
   national relations, 44  
 Multi-groups society, 19  
 Morgenthau, Prof—on Suprasectional  
   loyalties, 19  
 Minorities, 28  
 "Melting Pot", 30, 31  
 MacIver,  
   —on Universal Brotherhood, 13  
   —'Universitas Humana', 13  
   —Social conflict, 13  
 Muslim League, 282, 283, 284, 287,  
   291  
 Minorities & Loyalty, 80  
 Minority Problem & Groups—Wiith on,  
   76  
 Minorities, Janowsky on, 75  
 Minority Problems of the United States,  
   —Hans Kohn on, 62  
 Minorities,  
   —MacIver & Page on, 46  
 Minorities,  
   —Azcarate, P. De on, 46  
 Minorities,  
   —principal rights of, 47  
 Minority Language of education con-  
   fined to primary stage, 48  
 Multinational States,  
   —Masaryk, Shotwell, Bauer & Jano-  
   wsky on, 50  
 Minorities,  
   —League of Nations on, 47, 49, 50  
 Minority,  
   —M de Mello Franco on, 51  
 Minorities,  
   —Lie, Trygve on, 51  
 Minority—Bauer on, 56  
 Minorities in American life,  
   —Donald Young on, 57  
 Minorities,  
   —Russia's attempt to deal with, 58  
 Muslim Convention (1961), 384  
 Muslim convention, Aligarh, (1953),  
   353-358  
   —Bharati Muslims, 354, 358

Majlis Ittehad-ul-Muslim, 364  
 Mohammad Ismail, 365  
 Montford Scheme, 309  
 Muslims in Republican India, 311-313  
 Muslims in Bombay State, 313  
 Mathematical Models of Political Inte-  
   gration, 33  
 Moral Integration, ●  
   —another dimension of Social Inte-  
   gration, 34  
 'Melting Pot', 35  
 "Marginals", 35  
  
 NAGARJUNA—a Yogic sectarian, 164  
 Najib-ud-Daulat—his message and Jihad,  
   210, 211, 213  
 Nanda, G. L., 417.  
 Nation,  
   —Haas on, 485  
   —Ortega y Gasset on, 486  
   —Jacques Maritain on, 486  
   —Burke on, 486  
 National Anthem, community singing of  
   in schools, 504, 511  
   —Seth Govind Das on, 518, 519  
 National flag—and Indian Muslims, 519,  
   520  
 National antagonism and assimilation, 56  
 Nation as a community,  
   —Trygve Lie on, 79  
 Nation is the largest effective commu-  
   nity, 15  
 National federalism—doctrine of in  
   U.S.S.R.'s new constitution, 57  
 National federalism of Janowsky, 15  
 National integration, 40, 41  
 National Integration Committee, 380  
 National Integration Council, 398  
 National Integration Committee, 404  
 National Integration Committee—Report  
   adopted, 498  
   —economic grievances, 498, 501  
 National Integration Committee, 492,  
   493, 494  
   —communal quotas for jobs, 498  
 National integration conference, 501, 502  
   —and appointment of minorities com-  
   mission, 503  
   —and important decisions, 504  
   —on secondary education and lan-  
   guage, 505  
 National Integration—the goal of Con-  
   stituent Assembly, 488

- Frank Anthony on, 489, 490
- Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on, 490
- Smt. Indira Gandhi on, 492
- National Integration Committee, 386
- National Integration and Regionalism,
  - C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar committee on, 505, 506
- National Integration,
  - Smt. Indira Gandhi on, 500
  - Pandit Nehru on, 500
  - Seminar on, 501
  - concept of, 502
  - Home Ministry on, 506
- National Minorities,
  - Marx on, 40
  - Azcarate on, 49
  - Claude Inis on, 49, 53
  - Boehm, Max Hildebart on, 49
  - Sir B. Namier on, 51
- National Minorities of Central & Eastern Europe,
  - Otto Bauer and Karl Renner on, 50
- Nationalist Muslim Convention,
  - began with Mohammed Iqbal's song, 521
- Nationalist Muslims—to secure reservation of seats, posts, positions etc., 385
- Nation of Nations—United States as a, 95
- National Societies—Morgenthau on, 20
- National Society and social integration,
  - Hans Morgenthau on, 487
- National solidarity in U.S.A. and Minorities as obstacles to, with on, 76
- National spirit of Hindus raised by Shivaji, Ramdas and leaders of Maharashtra, 313
  - Hafeez Malik on, 213, 214
- Nation State—and integration, integrated condition of, 37
- National States—Ernst Haas on, 487
- National Symbols, 517, 518, 521,
  - Annadurai, 519
  - Justice Frankfurter on, 521
  - & National Integration Conference, 522
- Negroes and 'black power', 62
- Negroes and pluralistic adjustment, 60
- Negro culture in America,
  - Louis Lomax on, 60
- Negroes in America—Militant towards
  - desegregation, 60
- Negro-White problem—assimilation, 15
- Negro-White relationship in the States,
  - Prof Robin M. Williams on—60, 61
- Niebuhr, Reinhold, 38
- Nizam, 219
- North Arcot Muslim League conference, 425
- 'Now or never'—a pamphlet by Muslim students in London—on the aspirations of Muslims, 263
- OFFICIAL LANGUAGE ACT & ASIAN GOVT., 472
- Official Language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script, 416
- PAKISTAN, DR. LATIF ON PLANS OF, 268
- Pakistan, as protector of Moslem minorities, 83
- Pakistani Invasion, 512
- Pakistan's Pact with China, 295
- Pakistani Infiltration, 295
- Pakistan, its trauma, 488
- Palaces of Hindu and Muslim Kings,
  - General Cunningham on, 253,
- Pan-Islamic View, 201
- Panipat, Third battle of, Jadunath Sarkar on, 214
  - G. S. Sardesai on, 215
- Pant, G. B., 472
- Pant, G. B., on the ghost of two nations, 301
- Patil, S. K., 352, 367
- Peasants' Revolt, Prof. Dobree on, 2
- Persian Taste in Architecture and Moghul Emperors, 237, 238
- Personality in terms of integration, 27
- Phatak, G. S. 534
- Plural Society,
  - Furnivall, J. S., on, 66
  - concept of, Smith on, 69
  - and Welfare, 67, 68
  - Braithwaite on, 70
  - Brown on, 70
  - of Pre-Independence India, 72
  - of Canada, Prof. E. C. Hughes on, 70, 71
- Pluralistic Society,
  - G. E. C. Catlin on, 96
  - Furnivall on, 96, 99
  - R. Emerson on, 96, 97
- Political Scientists and Integration, 36
- Porch, Hindu, Fergusson on, 228
- Prakash Vii Shastri, 396

Preceptors, canonized and idolised, 186  
 Prem Bhatia, 398, 399  
 Primary Group, MacIver on, 29

### QURESHI,

—on the ascendance of Islam, 203, 204  
 —on Urdu, 463  
 Quttubuddin Aibak, 202

### RACE FICTION—PROF. ROBERT E. PARK,

3  
 Race-riots or Negro-white relations, 16  
 Racial groups—MacIver on, 16  
 Dr Radhakrishnan, 396, 397  
 Raghavan, R. V., 353  
*Raghuvamsa* of Kalidasa—Vedantic terminology in, 157  
 Rajagopalachari, 280  
 Rajput architecture, uniqueness of, Ferguson and Burgess on, 255  
 Rajputs and development of Indian culture, continuous, 245  
 Rajputs, Prof Kabir on, 242, 243  
 Rajputs and struggle with Aurangzeb—M. R. Majumdar on, 244  
 Rama as the Supreme deity, 171  
 Ramanand ascetics—establishing centres in the Punjab and Rajasthan, 198  
 Ramananda and Muslim trends—Qureshi on, 172  
 Ramananda and Tulasidasa—their influence ignored by Qureshi, 197  
 Ramlal on Marathas, 208  
 —on Shivaji 208  
 Rana Hammira, 192  
 Rana Kumbha's 'Kiitstambha' at Chitod—representing cultural side, 196  
 Ranpur temple, Brown, Burgess, Ferguson, Havell, Tara Chand, 230, 231, 234  
 Rapprochement in the architectural field  
 Abid Husain on, 255  
*Religious Leaders*, 320, 321, 361  
 Reservations breed, communal, political organisations, 121  
 Reservation as anti-national—Col. B. Z. Haidi and Tajmal Hussain, 121  
 Reservation of seats—Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel on, 120  
 Richardson, Alan, 32  
 Right of Minorities—Yugoslavia Making a strong case for, 101  
 Roman Script—Indian Education Com-

mission on, 467  
 Roman Script—use of in Aligarh University, 415  
 Roosevelt, Franklin, The New Deal, of, 57  
 Dr B. C. Roy, 472, 474  
 Royal Institute of International Affairs, 38

### Saivism or Siva-theism,

—well formulated in North India during Indo-Parthian Period, 166  
*Samudragupta* & "Asvamedha", 165  
 Sanjiva Reddy, 386  
 Sanskrit Commission, 412  
 Sanskrit & South Indian Languages, 438, 439  
 "Satymeiva Jayate", 516  
 Script,  
 —Devanagiri, 442, 457  
 —Roman, 442, 455, 457  
 —Urdu, 442, 457, 459 & 460  
 —Indian National Congress on, 443  
 —in USSR, 455, 456, 457  
 —Emotional Integration Commission on, 455  
 —in Muslim Countries, 456, 457  
 —Cyrillic, 457  
 —Nagari, 460  
 —Koranic, 466

### Secular Character of State, in India, preserved, 116

Self-determination—Prof. Rupert Emerson on, 109, 110

Self-surrender (*Prapatti*) & *Guru-Bhakti*, —Tarachand on, 170

### Separatist Scheme,

—of two Aligarh Muslim Professors (Syed Zafarul Hasan and Mohammad Afzal Qadri), 275, 276, 277, 278, 279  
 —Dr Rajendra Prasad on, 279

Separatist interests of the Muslims—first Full Plan by Nawab Sir Shah Navaz Khan on, 264

Seth Govind Das—against two-nations Theory, 119

Shahid Syed Ahmed & Struggle of Muslims,

—Hafeez Malik on, 216  
 —rulers of Bukhara & Afghanistan incited to re-establish Islamic rule, in India, 217,



- Shah Waliullah & Shahid Sayyid Ahmad Bareilvi,  
—Malik on 131  
—Qureshi & Ahmed on, 132  
—Dr Hakim on, 132  
—Dr Tara Chand on, 132  
—figure in 3 books by Indian Muslim, 132, 133
- Shahjahan & Aurangzeb & Destruction of Hindu Temple, 203
- Shaikh Abdulla, 419, 420, 421
- Shaiva Siddhanta School of 'Monism'—Developed by Vasugupta in Kashmir, 167
- Shankaracharya & Ramanuja,  
—Qureshi on, 138, 139  
—Abid Husain on, 142, 143
- Shankaracharya,  
—formulated his Philosophy on his own, 168  
—not of Kerala-Dravidian Origin but probably of Indo-Aryan Origin, 168  
—& his work, 169
- Shared Values, 34
- Shrimali, K. L. 401
- Sikandar, M. F., 367
- Sirhindi—the "Mujaddid" "—a regenerator of Islam in India", 133, 134
- Sirhindi, made Indian Islam "rigid & Conservative", 135  
—pioneer of isolationist Indo-Pakistani Islam, 135  
—Abul Kalam Azad influenced by Sirhindi's Writings, 135, 136
- Sirhind's anti-integrative approach—Dr Tarachand on, 136
- Sirhindi's League of Communal Hatred—Dr Mohammad Yasin on, 136
- Sirhindi's Views, annihilation of Hindus, 199  
—Work anti-rapprochement & anti-integration, 200
- Sirhindi,  
—Undoing work of Akbar, 201  
—bringing Jahangir & Aurangzeb to his views, 201
- Sirhindi & Cause of Islam—Royal Support by Muslim Rulers, 206
- Simla Conference, 290
- Simpson & Yinger—on the Problem of the Negroes, 59
- Sir Stafford Cripps, 284
- Six Muslim Provinces, 283
- Sixteenth Constitution Amendment,  
—Nandan Kagal on, 509, 510  
—D.M.K's Agitation on, 510
- Smith, W. C., 381-2
- Smith, W. R., 307
- Social Assimilation, 14  
—definition of, 32
- Social Changes Cause Temporary Strains over level of Tension, 7
- Social Conflict, 24
- Social Disintegration, 32
- Social interaction, 25
- Social integration,  
—assessed by Crime Index, 33  
—Welfare-effort Index, 33  
—MacIver & Page on, 33
- Social integration and Nation—Prof. James Coleman on, 487
- Social integration & Totalitarianism, 34
- Social Problem of America, 33
- Social Processes—Prof. Kimball Young on, 22
- Social Tensions, 19  
—Cover inter-personal & inter-group tensions, 9  
—destructive of sense of Cohesion, 42
- Society,  
—an integrate of groups & their individual members, 13  
—treated as Primary Concept, 17
- Sociology,  
—American, Hundred Years old, 10  
—as Science that deals with social groups, 18
- Social Tensions,  
—lack of attention paid, 1, 2  
—note on by Fairchild, 2  
—Prof. Quincy Wright on, 4, 5
- 'Society' and 'community' defined, 78  
—Trygve Lie on, 78, 79
- Society, concept of,  
—Trygve Lie on, 91, 92, 94  
—L. T. Houghhouse on, 92  
—Robert E. Park on, 92  
—E. W. Burgess on, 92  
—R. M. MacIver on, 92  
—Economists' view, 92  
—Anthropologist's view, 92  
—Walter Sullivan on, 92
- Society & Community, 15
- Society, defined, 10
- Society with plural features, 67
- Solidarity of a community—MacIver's

- description of, 16
- South Indian Architecture—Percy Brown on, 257
- South Indian Language & Sanskrit, 438
- South India Saving—"Intellectual Life from Stagnation"—Abid Husain on, 137, 138
- Spatial Segregation—Ashraf on, 207, 208
- Special rights in India, guaranteed for "Sections of Society" & not as minorities, 114, 117
- Spencer, Herbert, 28
- State as a society, Trygve Lie on, 79, 80
- State, National or Multi-national, Trygve Lie on, 80
- State & Nationality, 15
- States Reorganization Commission, 287
- State & Society,  
—Louis Wirth on Distinction between, 93  
—Angell on, 94  
—Dean Wageen on, 94  
—Stanley Hoffmann, 94  
—C.E.G. Catlin on, 94  
—Haas on, 94
- Styles of Architecture, Brown on, 224, 225
- C Subramanian—on Personal Law, 300
- C. Subramaniam—on Hindi, 477
- Sufi-monism as Vedanta of Shankara in Muslim costume—Aziz Ahmad on, 152
- Sufi poets of Islam & Saiva Literature of the South—Qureshi, 138
- Sufism—discarded by Sirhindi as pro-Hindu, 152
- Sunderdasa, a disciple of Dadu,—organising the fighting Naga Section, 198
- Supreme Court Decision on American Negroes, 68
- Syed Abdul Latif on Muslim Problem in India, 267
- Syed Badrudduja, 353, 358, 360
- Syed, Mahmud Dr., 407, 422, 502, 503  
—on special treatment for Muslims, 302  
—Muslim convention, 389, 390  
—Presiding on conference of Orissa Muslims, 401  
—on All India Muslim Consultation Convention, 423, 424
- Sir Syed Sultan Ahmad, 284, 285, 294, 295
- Systems, integrated & unintegrated, 27
- System of Tensions—Lewin on, 5
- TAFT, RONALD, 32
- Takht-Nashini ceremony & Aga Khan, 520
- Tamil Literature's debt to Indo-Aryan culture—Prof. Nilakanta Sastri on, 181
- Tamil opposition to Hindi, 439
- Tamil Madras against Hindi—enthusiastic of the North, 477
- Tamil region and anti-Hindi,  
—Tamil formulae, 507  
—C. Rajagopalchari on, 507, 513  
—Tamilnad Students agitation, 513
- Tara Chand,  
—on religious thought of the South, 141  
—on Shankara, 148, 149, 150  
—on Sufi conception values and acharya, 170  
—on the extent of Muslim influence, 187
- Tensions, Hans Morgenthau on, 1
- Tensions, brought to the forefront by psychology for international conflict, 1
- Tensions and conflicts, 26
- Tension and conflict lead to struggle, 9
- Tension—defined as driver of organic urges originating in the autonomic nervous system, 4
- Tension, in dynamics of political life—concept by Harold Lasswell, 4
- Tension, index and aftermath of conflict, 1
- Tensions level—concept used by A. L. Lowell, 4
- Tension Level, indicative of the dynamic of political life, 4
- Tension level—can be raised by social maladjustment or by prior cultural conflict, 8
- Tension level—referred to as "Social atmosphere" by Lewin, 6
- Tension, origin from the discipline of Physiology and Physiological Psychology, 4
- Tensional Psychology, system developed by Kurt Lewin, 4, 5
- Tension and repeated conflict—between Muslims & Rajputs, 192

Tension—the nutritional and the sexual prime, 4

Three Languages formula, M. DASON, 445

—State Ministers to implement, 445

Three Language formula in Madras, 478, 481

—M. Bhaktavatsalam on, 479

—Kamraj on, 480, 481

—in Bengal, M. P., Rajasthan, and U.P., 481

Tipu seeking help of Turkey, 218

Tirumular, a Kashmirian, 184

Trade-routes of N. India converged on Kalyan, 243

Tragedy of Hyderabad—W. C. Smith on, 303

Tod on Ajmir, 245

Tower of Fame at Chitod, 232, 247, 250

Trinidad Society—Marton Klass on, 68

Two-nations theory of Muslim League of Mr. Jinnah, 130

Two-nations theory and partition of India, 488

Tyabji, B.F.H.B.,

—on Indonesian names and Islamic renaissance, 405

—on Asoka, 406

—on National Flag and National emblem of India, 407

—on his Heroes, 407

—on Islam & Iran, 408

—on link with China, 408

—on Japan, Culture of, 409

—on India and cultural malaise, 409, 415

—Indian National Academy proposed, 409

—on language, 412

on Chagla, 419

UNION GOVERNMENT MEMORANDUM OF 1956—on Language, 471

Union of Pakistan and Hindustan, 283

Unity of Country to create a national identity, 104

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, —Wirth on, 16

—adoption of by U. N., 77

Universal Declaration of Human Rights —and minorities, 123

Unity of the American nation, 14

Urdu language of Muslims, 43

Urdu,

—demand as a regional language—

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan on, 465

Urdu and Sindhi—minority language, 43

Urdu University, 393

U.S.S.R. constitution on Duties of Citizens, 81

YEAR 1761 is a red-letter one, 219

“Yogie” path of Salvation and “bhakti”, 177, 178

Yugoslav Constitution on Duties of Citizens, 81

Yugoslavia and minorities, 124, 125, —and religious education, 124

—marriage and family in, 124, 125

Yugoslav Constitution and symbols, 518

Yugoslavia and marriage laws, 532

Young—Kimball, Prof.—“group” on importance of, 12

VALLABHBHAI PATEL, 287, 298, 299

Value categories on value dimensions, 19

Variety and Separatism—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on, 133

Vested social interest tends to perpetuate itself, 118

Viceroy, 279, 284, 293

Viceroy's Council, 284

Vijayanagara, the greatest glory of Mediaeval India,

—Abdul Razzaq on, 193

—James Fergusson on, 193

—No mention in books of Humayun Kabir and Abid Husain, 193, 194

Voluntary migrant groups and literature, 107

Wagner, Von Richard W.,

—integration as a sense of Community, 40

Walullah and solidarity of Muslims, 211, 212

“We-groups” create hostility to all groups, 24, 25

Welles-Summer—against rights for racial or religious minority, 54

Whole society as one stream, 35

William Benton—on secondary stage syllabus in U.S.S.R., 454

Wirth, Louis,

- on minorities, 46
- on American model to solve minority problems, 58
- Working Committee of the Congress—  
not to oppose Muslim convention, 385, 386
- World community—Ernst Haas supports development of, 111
- ZADROZNY, J. T.—defines minority, 45

- Zafrullah Khan on riots, 317
- Zakaria Dr.—on Indian secularism, 420
- Zaehner R. C., on Hindu and Muslim  
Mysticism, 142
- Znaniecki, Florian—on group for sociology, 11, 12
- Znaniecki, Florian—viewed national solidarity for international conflicts as group phenomena, 18
- Zaidi, Col. B. H., 370, 397, 398, 400

